

5-2015

Eroticism in Theognis

Josh C. Koerner

University of Arkansas, Fayetteville

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholarworks.uark.edu/wllcuht>

Recommended Citation

Koerner, Josh C., "Eroticism in Theognis" (2015). *World Languages, Literatures and Cultures Undergraduate Honors Theses*. 2.
<http://scholarworks.uark.edu/wllcuht/2>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the World Languages, Literatures and Cultures at ScholarWorks@UARK. It has been accepted for inclusion in World Languages, Literatures and Cultures Undergraduate Honors Theses by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@UARK. For more information, please contact ccmiddle@uark.edu, drowens@uark.edu, scholar@uark.edu.

Eroticism in Theognis

An Honors Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for Honors Studies
in Classical Studies

By:
Joshua Koerner

2015
Classics
J. William Fulbright College of Arts and Sciences
The University of Arkansas

Introduction and Background to Theognis

3

Background to Symposium

13

Eroticism in the Theognidean Corpus

25

Appendices

75

Bibliography

122

Acknowledgements

125

Introduction and Background to Theognis

Understanding masculinity and the way it self-defines is an integral part of understanding symposia as “masculine,” and using an elite context inherently includes in its discussion a greater degree of contrast between the self, or the community that identifies in a particular way, and the other. Further, given that sexuality is an integral component to the human experience, it is quite relevant to pursue the question of eroticism in a general context as well as the specific. Equally, understanding ancient social and sexual contexts creates space in which one may see modern understandings through a lens not dissimilar to that of science fiction, where world building coincides with the forwarding of certain ideas that are not appropriate to discuss in a *contexte actuelle*. Thus, approaching ancient sexuality is a means to find a real environment in which sexual understandings and contexts are radically different from the present, in order to provide commentary on current trends in representing the exchange between social and sexual identities. This thesis will present evidence for such an environment created by using the poetry of the so-called Theognidean corpus for the purpose of understanding the social construction of gender and sexuality, a collection of poems that deals with social and sexual identities among elite Greeks in the sixth century BCE. By studying the self-presentation in these elegies, we can gain a better perspective on the human experience of the erotic.

Theognidean poetry is paradigmatic of sympotic environments in Archaic Greece, meaning that it can be used for the purpose of understanding typically

accepted ideas and modes of communication in certain class-oriented social environments.

Following this introduction, I will include a section on the Theognidean poet in order to provide the context of the work. This will be followed by a small discussion on the symposium, which is a further background to the social and physical context of the performance of the poetic corpus as a whole. I will be examining the contexts of themes of erotic love, physical characteristics attributed to Aphrodite (in the context of social values), friendship, and hate relationships in the Theognidean corpus. I will do this further by approaching the specific manifestation of these themes in the poetry relating to the paradigmatic erotic boy.

The themes in the Theognidean corpus of erotic love, physical characteristics attributed to Aphrodite, friendship, and hate relationships raise broad questions which apply to each of them. All of the following questions and their application will be examined in the context of specifically selected poems that are either particularly indicative or are the only examples in the corpus. They have been chosen because they among the other poems potentially to be used are more useful for this survey of eroticism in Theognis. I will ask about the grammatical functions of words that relate to these themes, and why they are in those forms. I will ask how many times the thematic elements appear in the corpus, what their contexts are, and what is generalizable from those contexts. Further, I will investigate the social contexts of the thematic elements in each poem. Among these questions, I will ask the grammatical functions and the

purpose of the constructions relating to the conceptualization of the ideal erotic male boy, as well as the social context of the ideal erotic male boy in selected poems.

Further, there will be two interludes in which there will be cross-contextual questions including which ideas of love are used in relation to the ideal erotic male boy, the differences in usage between using masculine Eros and feminine Aphrodite as evidenced in the poetic contexts. I will first examine poems that use the word Eros and its cognates, and see that Eros occupies on the spectrum of love positions in the extremities, positions not only harmful to one's social station but also ones that one is sometimes forcibly driven to engage in. In the next section, we will see that the use of Aphrodite in the selected Theognidean poetry indicates that Aphrodite occupies a position that is neither extreme nor external; her effects being felt internally when refused or resisted are not so great that they cannot be overcome or dealt with. After a comparison of references to Eros and Aphrodite, I will show that Aphrodite is a passive element, not a true agent, and that Eros is active and an agent, external to outmoded penetration models and focalizations on roles to be played. Following this, we will see that Philos in the Theognidea occupies thematic space that keeps itself from overpowering and overwhelming boundaries, as they exist between humans and are not resultant of the intervention of gods. The next section concerns itself with Hate, where we will see that hate relationships are not divinely inspired but caused by human interaction; where human transgression caused by human action is grounds for hate, but human transgression caused by divine action is not. Finally, I will

examine poems that use Boy, where we will see that the erotic boy is of great interest to the Theognidean poet in physically erotic contexts. All translations will be by J.M. Edmonds, from 1931.

We will here briefly examine a few themes and background elements in Theognis in order to provide a greater context for the poetic corpus. This will include the man Theognis, and where he lived. We will look at the way that Theognis saw his city and answer some questions about authorship in Archaic Greece as it relates to Theognis.

The Theognidean corpus was written over a period during the seventh to the sixth centuries, totaling over a hundred years of composition. Thus arise questions of authorship relating to Theognidean poetry. However, Theognis was a real person, an aristocrat in Megara. Megara was approximately 51 kilometers (~30 miles) from Athens. Megara was a dependent of Corinth, a distance of about 53 kilometers (~33 miles). The Theognidean corpus is divided into two books, the first carrying the bulk of the poetry. The second is widely regarded as not being originally by the pen of Theognis, but by authors who emulated effectively Theognis's style. Further, the poems are distinguished by line number and are broken up with respect to their content. There are 1389 lines total in the Theognidean corpus.

The poem 667-682 is a window into the way that the Theognidean poet saw his city.

εἰ μὲν χρήματ' ἔχοιμι, Σιμωνίδη, οἷάπερ ἦθη
 οὐκ ἂν ἀνιώμην τοῖς ἀγαθοῖσι συνών:
 νῦν δέ με γινώσκοντα παρέρχεται, εἰμί δ' ἄφωνος
 χρημοσύνη, πολλῶν γνοὺς ἂν ἄμεινον ἐτέων,
 οὔνεκα νῦν φερόμεσθα καθ' ἰστία λευκὰ βαλόντες
 μηλίου ἐκ πόντου νύκτα διὰ δνοφέρην:
 ἀντλεῖν δ' οὐκ ἐθέλουσιν: ὑπερβάλλει δὲ θάλασσα
 ἀμφοτέρων τοίχων: ἦ μάλα τις χαλεπῶς
 σῶζεται οἱ ἔρδουσι: κυβερνήτην μὲν ἔπαυσαν
 ἐσθλόν, ὅτις φυλακὴν εἶχεν ἐπισταμένως,
 χρήματα δ' ἀρπάζουσι βίη: κόσμος δ' ἀπόλωλεν,
 δασμὸς δ' οὐκέτ' ἴσος γίνεται ἐς τὸ μέσον:
 φορτηγοὶ δ' ἄρχουσι, κακοὶ δ' ἀγαθῶν καθύπερθεν:
 δειμαίνω μή πως ναῦν κατὰ κύμα πῆη.
 ταῦτά μοι ἤνιχθω κεχρησμένα τοῖς ἀγαθοῖσιν:
 γινώσκοι δ' ἂν τις καὶ κακός, ἂν σοφὸς ἦ

Had I wealth, Simonides, equal to my character, I should not be so sad as I am in the company of the good. But alas! Wealth passeth by one that he knoweth, and I am speechless for want, albeit I should have seen better than many of my fellow-townsmen that now, with our white sails lowered, we are carried through the murky night from out the Melian Sea, and bale they will not, though the sea washeth over both gunwales; O but great is our jeopardy that they do what they do! —they have stayed the hand of a good steersman who had them in the keeping of his skill, and they seize the cargo perforce; order there is none, and fair division for all is no more; the menial porters are in command, and the bad above the good; I fear me lest the ship be swallowed of the waves. Such be my riddling oracle for the good, but a bad man will understand it also, if he have wit.¹

The city-state (*polis*) is full of discord (*stasis*), and “this affliction is here

envisaged as a violent storm that threatens the ship of state.” (Figueira 1984: 24)

Although Theognis does not use the words *polis* and *stasis* here, his reference to

the foundering ship is a riddling allusion that he expects his audience to

understand. *Polis* and *Stasis* are ideas familiar to the audience alluded to by the

poet. Further, the word in line 681 meaning “to make allusive

utterances” (ἤνιχθω)² is one that is also separating his audience from the rest of

¹ J.M. Edmonds

² LSJ

the society. In order to understand those allusions, they must be skilled (*sophos*-the idea of being skillful with regard to poetry) “in the context of the *ainos* (story, tale), and moreover they must be ‘skilled in understanding poetry’” (Figueira 1984: 24). This would by necessity apply as much to the poet as the audience. Thus when the poet speaks of the ship of state in at sea and in a storm, being aware of the metaphor allows the audience to be aware of incoming tragedy in the tangible world of the city-state (*polis*). Theognis accomplished this by expressing the bond between himself as poet and his audience with specific communication. One way he did so was, “to deploy the word *Philos* (dear, friend) and its derivatives” (Figueira 1984: 26). When the poet chooses to integrate the word *Philos*, he integrates his audience much the same way that breaking the fourth wall or creating fictional characters with whom one can easily identify does in modern performance. This creates private space in the public forum of the symposium, as those who are *Philo*i (friends) are linked by connection to the poet, to each other, and by their mutual understanding of one another to create community among the participants of the aristocratic symposia at which Theognis performed. (Figueira 1984: 27) Furthermore, the context is sympotic because the walls of the city and the walls of the ship are keeping out the sea, the sea which is a metaphor as well for wine, and the walls of the ship (arguably) the *andreion*, where the symposium was taking place. Furthermore, the ship of state is carrying all of the politically relevant men, just like the symposium is.

From this short example, we can conclude that Theognis is creating and operating within a manifestation of private community that we will examine later as aristocratic, one that is politically integrated and politically affective. Theognis sees his city as fundamentally influenced by a small community of elites who also comprise a social community. The fellow-townsmen Theognis refers to are in fact this small elite social circle as his fellow townsmen are on the ship with him, in the symposium with him.

Furthermore, lines 19-26 provide another example of the way that Theognis reaches out to his audience:

Κύρνε, σοφιζομένω μὲν ἔμοι σφρηγίς ἐπικείσθω
τοῖσδ' ἔπεσιν, λήσει δ' οὔποτε κλεπτόμενα,
οὐδέ τις ἀλλάξει κάκιον τοῦσθλοῦ παρεόντος,
ὧδε δὲ πᾶς τις ἐρεῖ: 'Θεύγνιδός ἐστιν ἔπη
τοῦ Μεγαρέως πάντα δὲ κατ' ἀνθρώπους ὀνομαστοῦ,
ἀστοῖσιν δ' οὔπω πᾶσιν ἀδεῖν δύναμαι:
οὐδὲν θαυμαστόν, Πολυπαΐδη: οὐδὲ γὰρ ὁ Ζεὺς
οὔθ' ὕων πάντεσσι' ἀνδάνει οὔτ' ἀνέχων.

Let the seal of the wise man, Cynrus, be set upon these lines, and they shall never be filched from him, nor shall evil ever be changed with their good, but every man shall say 'These are the lines of Theognis of Megara, famous throughout the world,' albeit I have not yet been able to please all my fellow-towns-men — nor is that to be marvelled at, thou son of Polypaus, seeing that Zeus himself pleaseth not every man neither in the sending of the rain nor in the withholding of it. But 'tis with good intent to thee, Cynrus, that I shall give thee the counsels which I learnt from good men in my own boyhood.³

The seal which Theognis places on his text is a very complex issue and we will touch on it later when discussing the authorship of the Theognidea; yet due to its complexity, we may also speak on it presently. Considering it in the context of being skilled with regard to poetry (*sophos*), there is an implication that if one breaks the seal and uses the poetry incorrectly, changes it overmuch, they will

³ J.M. Edmonds

inherently confuse the message and the value and validity of the corpus will be broken (Figueira 1984: 29). Furthermore, Theognis sets himself apart from the “townsmen,” whom he labels as, “ἄστοῖσιν.”

Furthermore, when Theognis says, ‘These are the lines of Theognis of Megara, famous throughout the world,’ he is also making note that the audience of his performance poetry is not just those who hear it in the symposia that he performs at, but all Greeks (Figueira 1984: 30). This is so that, “the poetry of Theognis... is a dynamic institution that responds to the evolution of the community it embraces,” despite “present[ing] itself as static, unchangeable,” as a result of its seal. (Figueira 1984: 33) He reflects the evolution of his community in the changing nature of his poetry, and his advice throughout the corpus. (Figueira 1984: 41) And we see him further not just dispensing advice but also judgment (805-810 / 543-546 (following))

543-546

χρή με παρὰ στάθμην καὶ γνώμονα τήνδε δικάσσαι,
Κύρνε, δίκην, ἴσόν τ' ἀμφοτέροισι δόμεν,
... Μάντεσσι τ' οἰωνοῖς τε καὶ αἰθομένοις ἱεροῖσιν,
ἄφρα μὴ ἀμπλακίης αἰσχρὸν ὄνειδος ἔχω.

543-546

I must decide this suit by [marking block] and square, Cyrnus, and be fair to both parties, [on the one side ...] and on the other prophets and omens and burnt-offerings, or else I shall bear the foul reproach of wrong-doing.⁴

If the one who consults the oracle (*theoros*) is Theognis, as one is likely to suspect, it is his judgment (*dike*) that will lose face if it is strayed from. (As one

⁴ J.M. Edmonds

may see, the passage above does not contain the word *theoros*. Instead, the idea is considered to help give an idea of the poet Theognis as a law-giver whose judgement is not his own, but comes from the gods. This is found in the fact that Theognis says “and on the other prophets [augurs]...” (Μάντεσί τ’ οἰωνοῖς), and is supported in Figueira.) In 543-546, Theognis says outright that he, “must render judgement,” placing himself further into the role almost of a lawgiver through his poetry. Thus the Theognidean poet sees himself as the sole exception to a rule, being that he is a lawgiver, interested in furthering the cause of the city-state, in a city that utterly lacks them.

Theognis then sees his city as morally bankrupt and needing guidance, with himself as the lead role in causing positive change. He sees the community that he builds around himself through his poetry and those which the reception of his poetry will be best suited to as the city, and this city (the community of people familiar with and benefiting from his poetry) needs some kind of change in order to not sink during the storm at sea.

Theognidean authorship is difficult to disentangle. We have previously spoken about the seal of Theognis in lines 19-30, but not concerning authorship. “...this passage is taken as a milestone marking the emergence of the notion of the poem as a literary object in a presumed evolution of literary self-consciousness in Greece from the anonymity of epic to the proud artistry of the poet in the 5th and 4th centuries” (Figueira 1984: 83). Modern ideas of authorship, furthermore are irrelevant, as bits and pieces of poetry were frequently passed around and altered slightly by those who passed it on, perhaps

remembering it incorrectly or intentionally changing a particular facet of the poem. The idea of being skilled with regard to poetry (*sophos*) does not matter in respect to the originality of the content, as much as “a rational and practical skill in various areas” (Figueira 1984: 83). This would result in a poet who does not necessarily aim for originality in tone, voice, style, or any specific new element that could be tied to him, but instead shows the degree with which one can understand his content as well as the authority with which he says what he says (Figueira 1984: 83).

Thus, when we look beyond the seal of Theognis being used as an identifier for the poet himself, it becomes a signifier for the corpus as being a “text” (Figueira 1984: 85). Furthermore, given the political nature of the sympotic environments that Theognis performed his poetry in, it makes further sense to deduce that there is political significance to his work, and that there is political significance to the seal of Theognis.

Background to Symposium

The symposium occupies ideological space for the ancient Greeks outside the realm of the established stereotypes of being *ὀρθός* (upright, correct), held in the public consciousness. However, the symposium was important politically, socially, and sexually. I first ask the basic questions: what is a symposium, who was there, what were they doing, when was it, and where was it? Following this, I would like to speak to the social contexts of symposia as well as the sources for our evidence of the symposium.

A general definition from Merriam - Webster's Dictionary of the word symposium is, "a convivial party (as after a banquet in ancient Greece) with music and conversation." In the Liddell-Scott Greek Lexicon, the definition is "a drinking party," in Ancient Greece, given that the word *symposium* (συμπόσιον) is an Ancient Greek word.

Presently I will give a general summary of my findings concerning the what, who, action, when, and where of the symposium, as well as social contexts and sources.

The chronological sequence of I will provide is from J. Bremmer (J. Bremmer, 135-148, 1990). Who attended symposia? Bremer says that in the earliest stages (1100-600 BCE) symposia catered to a unique set of individuals; although beginning as an outlet or social forum for elite men who fought together, it remained an elite holdout even when war became to a greater degree

democratized, which was reflected in the symposium. Thus, elite men with serving staff for food and wine (typically their sons poured the wine) and maybe a few entertainers such as flute girls or serving boys were the population of the earlier symposia (Koehl, 101; Bremmer, 138). The quantifiable change into the next stage (600-500) increased the number of entertainers, and increased the status of the younger men from serving to still-unequal members but members nevertheless, partaking in the symposium educationally. This education was socially oriented, including family histories and heroic lineages, masculine identity, and ideas about honor and warfare. Further, less food was served at symposia (Bremmer, 144) and the position of “king of the symposium” began appearing, and the arrival of poetry goes hand in hand with an increased sexual expression at symposia. The presence of poetry at symposia existed from the Homeric period, as Homer references symposia in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, whenever the elite warrior class are eating and drinking in a ritual manner, even the feasting meals at Odysseus’s house. However, the purpose of sympotic poetry changed through time, in the Archaic period reaching a degree of competition and fluid social expression not able to be found in epic forms, partially due to democratic political trends. Finally, towards the end of the Archaic period the young men become the primary participants of the symposia, the relationships between them and the entertainers become more overtly courtship-related, and finally these relationships move to the *palaistra* (a place where exercise and social interaction took place in a nearly solely masculine environment). The relationships move to the *palaistra* because the decreasing

social importance of the symposium as it operated in contexts that are under discussion with regard to Theognis and the increasing social importance of the *palaistra* for young men intersected. The poetry towards the end of the Archaic period becomes more overtly erotic and the political functions of the symposium start to fade. Soon after, war became less the realm of the elite (hoplite warfare ~600s BCE) and the winds of democratization were sweeping through other fields as well (510 BCE onward), the lack of interest in educating the youth by the elite and the soon to be impact of the first schools appearing after the Archaic period, the symposium disintegrated (J. Bremmer, 145, 1990) as Theognis would have recognized it.

What are the sources for the symposium? These include depictions on pottery as well as the poetic tradition. Theognidean poetry is viewed as paradigmatic of sympotic contexts. (Theognis of Megara, Lowell Edmunds, 96-111). So how valid is the evidence of pottery and poetry? Both are performance art in one degree or another. The former is going to be made and purchased for specific purposes; it will not be used to depict things that are irrelevant to its use nor will its very specific forms be able to be generally used in alternate contexts appropriately. A wine cup, one may argue, could be used as a water cup. But a krater is completely useless when one is drinking water alone, and is only useful when it is being used with the consumption of wine as well as water. Further, much pottery exists with painting or decoration of some kind on its surface for the purpose of telling a story or creating a mythical context for the use

of the vessel, etc, and these paintings on the pottery can be used as comparative evidence with poetry of symposia.

Poetry is little different. It was created for specific purposes within specific environments for specific audiences. As an art form, it was originally manifested as commissioned art, much like early Italian Renaissance painting. Poets would be held on retainer for the purpose of showing the status of their patron, and to say good things about him and his guests, and their status in society during the Homeric period and through the Archaic. As this changed and the poets became more the members of the symposia, in the case of the Theognidean poet for example, the poetry was used to say certain things about the poet, the environment, and the poet's relationships with the other members of the symposium. It was a very specifically manifest art form that would have been much out of place in other contexts. Therefore, sympotic poetry is distinguishable from the plurality of other forms of poetry for its very specific purpose and context in which it was practiced, and for which it was intended. (Ezio Pellizer, *Sympotica*, 177-184)

When was the Symposium practiced? This is a great question and it is a difficult one to answer as well. Evidence for the symposium, before it grew into the elements that would later characterize it, had roots in poetry of the Homeric period (*Iliad*, 9, 70-95; *Sympotica*, Jan M. Bremmer, 140 (*Iliad*, 1, 570-610)). The disintegration of sympotic practice occurred around the end of the Archaic period. Therefore, the symposium was practiced from the Homeric period (1100-800 BCE) through the archaic (800-480 BCE), indicating that the "when" of the

symposium was for about 620 years. (Bremmer, *Symptotica*, 135-145) This isn't to say that Plato's work *Symposium* is not speaking to symposia or a symposium itself in Classical Greece, but that the old style of the symposium, as Bremmer posits, was no longer practiced.

However, that is the easy answer. The more interesting one, to me, is concerned with the "clock time" of when the symposium was practiced. An aspect of the symposium that we have not yet touched on is the *komos* or revel that took place after certain symposia that had ventured a few steps too far into drunken transgression. The *komos* was a way for these agonistic elites to get out some of these energies in a socially acceptable manner, as they were even then still accorded some rights above and beyond the normal citizen. At any rate, the *komos* took place after the symposium, and the results from them are depicted as being realized in the mornings, making the *komos* something that occurs at night. Furthermore, symposia, when food was involved, was described as being something of a feast or a banquet, and when it occurs in Homer, it is after the day's fighting. In sum, symposia are practiced in the evening.

Knowing then that the elite symposium happened between (approximately) 1100 and 480 BCE, and that it took place in the evening, we are still overlooking one important aspect that we have touched on previously but is important to reiterate here, being the "when" of the participants. In the early symposia, only the elite men who had completed some sort of initiation ritual into manhood, be that fighting or killing a boar in a certain manner, were allowed to be active participants. (Bremmer, 139, 1990) The participants are primarily

citizens of the same polis, where the symposium is used in part to define status as a citizen for denizens of the same city. The younger men and boys were there for the purpose of learning from their elders, but they were not allowed to do certain things. At the beginning, they were not allowed to sit on the couches with the elder men. Later they were not allowed to recline. This was the case until the dissolution of real distinguishing elements between youth and man in the sympotic environment. Furthermore, those who were previously distinguished as not belonging (young men) were accorded not dissimilar status in their physical attitudes as men within the sympotic space. Thus for the major part of sympotic history, the “when” of the participants was in direct connection with their relationship to that society’s ideas of manhood and masculinity. If one identified socially as a man, his “when” as a man, then he was accorded certain privileges, and if they identified socially as pre-man as their “when,” they were of lesser station and the purpose for them of the symposium was educational. The “when” of a man is not limited to age, but also to physical manifestations of proving oneself, such as killing a boar. (J. Bremmer, 139, 1990) This may in part relate too to the distinction between lover and beloved, so that the lover has completed the initiation ritual and is accepted into the community and the beloved has not, and therefore is undergoing his education with the lover for the purpose of being able to complete the initiation ritual.

The “who” of symposia can be measured in some ways by the degree of elite male involvement, and their position in society. When the elites made war, they engaged in the self-affirming act of symposium. (Dining in a Classical

Context, Oswyn Murray 83-103) When the elites no longer had the monopoly on war, they used the symposium as an outlet for their intrinsically agonistic status. And this quite simply devolved as fewer and fewer elites found the symposium to be adequate in supporting, maintaining, and affirming the aspects of their identity which it had previously done. With this changing face of symposia, others stepped in to maintain the roles previously held by those leaving the regular practice; thus while young men were pursued by the male *élite*, when the young men began to be the primary participants in the symposia, they pursued even younger objects of their sexual affections, ultimately resulting in a fairly comprehensive change of demographics of sympotic participants, which in its own turn changed the demographics and level of involvement of artists, entertainers, and “available” objects of sexual attention in a more general sense.

What are the participants at symposia doing? In answering this question I will stick to the basics. For example, if a participant at a symposium is called a flute-girl, I may not mention that the flute girl plays the flute, but instead mention the other aspects of her involvement in the sympotic environment. The symposium began as a place for warriors to create and affirm bonds of friendship that would be felt on the battlefield. In these contexts, not unlike the Spartan *syssition*, food was as necessary a component as the wine which came later to characterize the symposia. However, in light of the changes discussed in the previous section, there also came about a change in the presence of sustenance. When the symposium was a place for elite men, citizens of the same polis, to

meet, educate their sons and other young men, prepare for battle and communally process the previous horrors of war, food was an important ingredient in the environment. The presence of food in elite environments is intrinsically indicative of their high status, as defined by the presence in their diet of elements that are for the lower classes impossible to acquire such as (stereotypically) meats, fruits, and fresh produce. The aspect of the later democratization of the symposium should not be undervalued, as this resulted, apart from the changes to the participants in the symposia, in changes in the practice of symposia. Wine was always an element, and always an important one, being what allowed the men to cope a little better with their horrifying experiences and to find merriment and pleasure in the company of others outside of stolid sobriety, and before transgressive drunkenness. However, wine grew in importance in the symposium, with solid food throughout the archaic period no longer being depicted on pottery in those contexts. (J. Bremmer, 144, 1990) The consumption of wine becomes the indicative element of sympotic environments, and as such the attendant fears surrounding the consumption of wine grow in primacy. Therefore, the practice of consuming wine becomes highly ritualized, with individuals nominated “king of the symposium” to moderate everyone’s level of drunkenness and keep general order, so that everyone may have a good time equally, without slipping into transgressive drunkenness.

Another element of sympotic activity was entertainment. This included flute girls, the presence of song, and performance of poetry in combination with the elite musical competitions that proved to themselves and one another that

they belonged to the group. Furthermore, there were also in some of these contexts highly sexually suggestive activity. At the early elite symposia, the sons would serve their fathers completely nude, so as to be erotically pleasing to the other men. There are numerous depictions in pottery and poetry of members of symposia gesticulating sexually with specific objects of their desire being clearly indicated (J. Bremmer, 142, 1990). As the sympotic environments became more focalized on courtship rituals between young men and younger objects of their desire, the sympotic rituals ironically enough changed themselves, with the erotic objects being more covered and the whole practice of courtship moving to the *palaistra* (J. Bremmer, 145, 1990).

Where was the symposium practiced? There are many questions and reams of paper on the subject of where the symposium was practiced in physically descriptive locative terms. That is a little beyond the scope of my ability and this introductory chapter to the environment of sympotic Theognidean poetry. Thus, I will take a different tack. The symposium was practiced in the ancient Greek city, the *polis*, which the symposium has been described as indicative of. Furthermore, the symposium was practiced largely indoors and likely in the home of one of its members. If these members are elites, then the symposium was practiced in a *polis* in an elite home (and as we have established in the previous section), and in the evening. The elites who participated at symposia were not hoplites by virtue of being elites, and this created a degree of political instability in the archaic and classical poleis - their control of war waning caused their political control to wane.

The relationship of the symposium to the *polis* is one that I would like to investigate a little further here, as it is an important part of understanding the “where” of the symposium. Given that it was elites who practiced symposia, and there was a leader to each symposium, and that during much of the period of the practice of symposia the *poleis* were oligarchically ruled, it follows that when the oligarchs gather socially, it is also a political gathering. That the boundaries blur between social and political, between impersonal and personal, and that the symposium as a social institution becomes indicative of the political institution of the *polis*. As a result of these, when we consider the “where” of the symposium, and we find that the symposium is in the *polis* and in the house of an elite male, that the symposium is also the *polis* and that the frequently used metaphor of the “ship of state” creates alternate, imaginary, socially-informed locations for the symposium. (Theognis of Megara, Daniel B. Levine, 176-196) The practice of the symposium is significant for defining the pre-classical elite male citizen. If the symposium is the *polis* and it holds within its walls the oligarchs of the city, the word describing the walls of the symposium becomes the word for the walls of the city, which is also the word for the walls of the ship. (τεῖχος) Thus, the “where” of the symposium is the *polis*, it is the ship of state. Considering the symposium as the ship of state indicates that it is on the sea, which follows the metaphor of wine as the sea (wine, too, being something that is felt in a physical sense). Thus, the symposium easily occupies imaginary, socially informed space as well as the physical location which apart from its general location I have given is a matter of serious and substantial debate.

What are the social contexts of the symposium? We have touched on a lot of these already, and so I would like to begin this section with a quick summation of where we are so far. The symposium was comprised of elite males of varying ages, differing degrees of participation of entertainers and servant staff, differing social norms over the 620 years of its practice as well as the differing socio-political situations in which it was practiced. There were substantial changes over its history in terms of the acceptability of and engagement in the (attempted) seduction of other members of the sympotic environment. The social context, then, appears to be quite fluid, so how can we begin to approach it in an effort to quantify what is going on across such a huge range?

When we are considering symposia as elite social environments, we must remember the importance of the banquet and the copious, conspicuous consumption of agricultural products in the context of an agricultural economy. Thus, the simple fact of the elites' ability to consume in the fashion of the banquet was a device that they used to differentiate themselves from those of lower class and of lesser distinction. This relates to modern experiences in the same realm of consumption of food products with the contrivances of manners and the extravagant requirements for the food and the patterns of behavior as we see still in modern elite circles but which date to Renaissance Italy and France. Further, the effect of this is that there are certain of social implications inherent in the process of elite communal consumption. The act of conspicuous consumption is the first distinguishing factor; the second is the social norms that are expected of the participants of such occasions. Despite their changing nature with the

changing nature of the needs of the elite social groups needing to be met, it can be established that these distinguishing factors of elite communal consumption existed in a general sense.

I would follow this with the assertion that different types of relationships occurred within symposia. From the basic friendship relationships, to much closer ones as well as erotic relationships even to ones that were maybe not friendly or not sincere, one of the important aspects of the social contexts of symposia were the relationships that existed and were fostered or harmed within their walls. Frequently, the symposium was used as a platform to test the quality of its members, competing in musical or poetic contests. Furthermore, as a subsection of relationships of the symposium, but comprising its own separate status is the individual and his unique and fluid identities. The social contexts of symposia are as much a result of the culmination of the effects of individual identities on one another and in concert as a single civic identity as other factors.

Eroticism in the Theognidean Corpus

Now that I have given a background to the poet of Theognidean poetry and the symposium, we may begin the examination of eroticism in the Theognidea. I will be examining the Theognidean corpus for contexts relating to eroticism. These include an examination of the use of the words Eros (love), Aphrodite, Philos (dear/friend), Hate, and Boy. I will keep in mind a number of cross-contextual questions during my examination. These include: Which ideas for love are used in relation to Boy? What is the difference between using masculine Eros and feminine Aphrodite as evidenced by the context of the poetry? I will first examine poems that use the word Eros and its cognates, and see that Eros occupies on the spectrum of love positions in the extremities, positions not only harmful to one's social station but also those that one is sometimes forcibly driven to engage in. In the next section, we will see that the use of Aphrodite in the selected Theognidean poetry indicates that Aphrodite occupies a position that is neither extreme nor external; her effects being felt internally when refused or resisted are not so great that they cannot be overcome or dealt with. After a comparison of references to Eros and Aphrodite, I will show that Aphrodite is a passive element, not a true agent, and that Eros is active and an agent. Following this, we will see that Philos in the Theognidea occupies thematic space that keeps itself from overpowering and overwhelming boundaries, as they exist between humans and are not resultant of the intervention of gods. The next section concerns itself with Hate, where we will see that hate relationships are not divinely inspired but caused by human

interaction; where human transgression caused by human action is grounds for hate, but human transgression caused by divine action is not. Finally, I will examine poems that use Boy, where we will see that the erotic boy is of great interest to the Theognidean poet in physically erotic contexts.

There are a number of poems in which the idea of Eros-love is used. The poems we will examine include: 1231-1234, 1275-1278, 1329-1334, 1335-1336, 1337-1340, 1341-1344, and 1345-1350. A few questions that seem to be worth answering to more fully understand the purpose of the usage of Ἔρως follow. What are the grammatical functions of the words relating to the idea of erotic love? Why are they in those forms? How many times does Ἔρως appear in the corpus? What are the contexts? What is generalizable? What are the social contexts of Ἔρως in the poems?

Let us first consider the grammatical function of words relating to erotic love. In poems 1231-1234 and 1275-1278 the proper noun form, Ἔρως is used, referring to the god directly, as the physical manifestation through which he interacts with the world.

1231-1234

Σχέτλι Ἔρωσ, μανίαι σ' ἐτιθηνήσαντο λαβούσαι:

ἐκ σέθεν ὤλετο μὲν Ἴλιου ἀκρόπολις,
ὤλετο δ' Αἰγείδης Θησεὺς μέγας, ὤλετο δ' Αἴας
ἐσθλὸς Ὀϊλιάδης σῆσιν ἀτασθαλίης.

Cruel **Love**, Frenzies were they that took thee up and nursed thee; through thee came ruin to Ilium's stronghold, came ruin to great Theseus son of Aegeus, and ruin to noble Ajax son of Oileus, by reason of thy presumptuousness.⁵

1275-1278

ὠραῖος καὶ Ἔρωσ ἐπιτέλλεται, ἥνικα περ γῆ
ἄνθεσιν εἰαρινοῖς θάλλει ἀεξομένη:
τῆμος Ἔρωσ προλιπὼν Κύπρον, περικαλλέα νῆσον,
εἶσιν ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους χάρμα φέρων κατὰ γῆν.

Love himself riseth in due season, when the earth swelleth and bloweth with the flowers of Spring; ay, then cometh **Love** from Cyprus' beauteous isle with joy for man throughout the world.⁶

Eros here (1231-1234) is being represented as having been raised by ones who were mad (crazy), as it was through him that the Trojan War happened, that Theseus died, that Oilean Ajax died. And further (127-1278) that he brings joy for man throughout the world, which makes Eros seem to be quite a generous deity.

In poem 1345, however, the regular noun is used, speaking of the sort of love that the Theognidean poet is representing as having for a boy.

⁵ J.M. Edmonds

⁶ J.M. Edmonds

1345-1350

Παιδοφιλεῖν δέ τι τερπνόν, ἐπεὶ ποτε καὶ Γανυμήδους
ἠράσατο Κρονίδης ἀθανάτων βασιλεύς,
ἀρπάξας δ' ἐς Ὀλυμπον ἀνήγαγε, καὶ μιν ἔθηκε
δαίμονα παιδείης ἄνθος ἔχοντ' **ἐρατόν**.
οὔτω μὴ θαύμαζε, Σιμωνίδη, οὔνεκα κἀγὼ
ἐξεφάνην καλοῦ παιδὸς **ἔρωτι** δαμείς.

1345-1350

A pleasant thing hath **lad's-love** ever been since Ganymede was loved of the great Son of Cronus, the king of the Immortals, who seized and brought him to Olympus and made him a God, 329 what time his boyhood was in its **lovely** flower. In like manner, Simonides, be not thou astonished that 'tis come out that I too am taken with the **love** of a fair lad.⁷

(The reference with nounal Eros is in the last line of the Greek and highlighted in the second to last line in the English.) The sort of love that using a substantive form of Eros induces the Theognidean poet's audience to understand him as having is strictly passionate, as the poem begins with a justification of loving boys by virtue of Zeus having done the same with Ganymede.

In poems 1329-1334, 1335-1336, 1337-1340, 1341-1344, 1345-1350, verbal forms of the concept of Ἔρως are found. (ἐρῶντι, ἐρῶν, ἐρῶ (x2), ἔρωτι, respectively) In the context of these verbal forms of Ἔρως the poet uses the term for boy, παῖς. Pederasty was conducted between an older, socially integrated man with a younger man beginning to enter society. Something else worth mentioning about the verbal forms of Ἔρως is that their occurrence is equally split between participles and finite verbs. Regardless, what this tells us is that erotic love inspired by Eros is something that can be acted out, sometimes violently- as we saw above in the case of Zeus and Ganymede (1345-1350).⁸

⁷ J.M. Edmonds

⁸ See appendix with referenced poems in Greek and in English

Why does it matter what the forms are in which the terms relating the idea of *Eros* and erotic love are found? If the god is being referred to or propitiated directly, he will be referenced with a proper noun. This leads me to believe that *Eros* was seen to be present and active in peoples' lives.

Also, in 1275-1278, *Eros* is referred to almost as his own season, rising and falling in his own time.

1275-1278

ώραίος καὶ Ἔρως ἐπιτέλλεται, ἡνίκα περ γῆ
ἄνθεσιν εἰαρινοῖς θάλλει ἀεξομένη:
τῆμος Ἔρως προλιπὼν Κύπρον, περικαλλέα νῆσον,
εἶσιν ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους χάρμα φέρων κατὰ γῆν.

1275-1278

Love himself riseth in due season, when the earth swelleth and bloweth with the flowers of Spring; ay, then cometh **Love** from Cyprus' beauteous isle with joy for man throughout the world.⁹

This too makes *Eros* out to be an active agent in the world. This is further supported by when the finite verbs and participles are active in voice (**θάλλει**, **φέρων**), their impact on their sentences is a mirror for their active impact on their environment. *Eros* seems to be being represented as an active force in the world in the eyes of the Theognidean poet.

Eros occurs 12 times in the corpus. Among the poems we are presently analyzing, there are nine of these occurrences. The remaining examples (1353-1356, 1369-1372, 1375-1376) have on the one hand less of an active sense to them, and on the other hand seem more gnostic than the other

⁹ J.M. Edmonds

examples which seem to be more personally relevant to the Theognidean poet.¹⁰

There is a small difference here worth noting too. There are two permutations of the same ER- stem, one meaning to love, and the other meaning to be comely, lovely, or pleasing. These are ἐράω and ἔραμαι, the former lacking a sexual component and the latter containing a sexual component.¹¹

Thus, we can begin to look at the contexts in which erotic love is found in the Theognidean corpus. Four of the poems seem to have negative contexts, leaving three of the poems to be more positive. Σχέτλι, μανίαι, ὤλετο, ἀτασθαλῆς in poem 1231-1234 mean respectively Cruel, mad ones/ raving or raging ones, to destroy, and recklessness/ wickedness.

1329-1334

σοί τε διδόντι τι καλὸν ἐμοί τ' οὐκ αἰσχρὸν ἐρῶντι

¹⁰ All relevant poems will appear in the appendix containing poetry.

¹¹ There are a number of poems that refer to the idea of being pleasing or lovely as opposed to erotic love, and those are being excluded from this discussion because they do not fit the idea of love that we are pursuing (255-256, 567-570, 653-654, 695-696, 773-782, 789-792, 885-886, 983-988, 1043-1044, 1129-1132, 1155-1156, 1157-1160, 1191-1194).

αἰτεῖν. ἀλλὰ γονεῶν λίσσομαι ἡμετέρων,
αἰδέο μ', ὦ παῖ καλὲ, διδοῦς χάριν, ἢ εἴ ποτε καὶ σὺ
ἤξεις Κυπρογενοῦς δῶρον ἰοστεφάνου
χρηίζων, καὶ ἐπ' ἄλλον ἐλεύσει, ἀλλὰ σε δαίμων
δοίῃ τῶν αὐτῶν ἀντιτυχεῖν ἐπέων.

1329-1334

To thee that grantest it my suit bringeth honour, and to me that desire it no disgrace; I beseech thee, by my parents, fair lad, have respect unto me and grant me favour; or if ever thou in thy turn shalt come to another to crave the gift of the violet-crown'd Cyprus-born, God grant thou meet with the same words that I meet with now.

Poem 1329-1334 is an entreaty to keep the poet away from the negative things, represented by αἰσχρὸν, χρηίζων (shameful/disgraceful, to want/ lack/ be in need). οὐκέτ, χαλεπὰς, ἀνίας, and μοχθούς are the negative terms in poem 1337-1340 meaning respectively no longer, difficult, grief/ distress/ trouble, and toil/ hardship/ distress. Οὐκέτι, no longer, is not intrinsically negative in the same sense as “grief” or “distress” is apart from being a negation, but when the verb that it negates is “love,” so that the poet says, “I will no longer love...” it seems to me to be a negative term. Poem 1341-1344 is our ultimate example.

1341-1344

αἰαί, παιδὸς ἐρῶ ἀπαλόχροος, ὅς με φίλοισιν

πᾶσι μάλ' ἐκφαίνει κούκ ἐθέλοντος ἐμοῦ.
τλήσομαι οὐ κρύψας ἀεκούσια πολλὰ βίαια:
οὐ γὰρ ἐπ' αἰκελίῳ παιδί δαμείς ἐφάνην.

1341-1344

Woe 's me! I love a smooth-skinned lad who exposeth me to all my friends, nor am I loath; I will bear with many things that are sore against my liking, and make it no secret; for 'tis no unhandsome lad I am seen to be taken with.

τλήσομαι, βίαια, αἰκελίῳ, and δαμείς represent the negative ideas respectfully of suffering, violence/force, shamefulnes, and being overpowered. The positive contexts of poems that use Eros include words like ώραῖος, ἄνθεσιν (1275-1278); ὄλβιος (1335-1336); ἄνθος, θαύμαζε, and τερπνόν (1345-1350) which mean respectively, beautiful, flowers, happy, flower, to wonder, to wonder, delight.

What does this mean? At first blush it appears that erotic concepts occupy the extremes of the spectrum of types of love. The negative terms are very negative and the positive ones are to an equal degree positive. There may be something generalizable with this. The god, Eros, is seen as only influencing events among humans and rising in his season when a height or a depth of the effects of love are felt. Erotic love is seen as being a visibly emotive type of love. This may be why, as in 1341-1344, the poet expresses the way he feels for the boy, ἐρῶ (to love), as being a pain to him in public and among his friends, with whom he is shamed. The idea continues to work if we consider 1275-1278, where the season of Eros rises with a reference as well to Aphrodite.

1275-1278

ώραῖος καὶ Ἔρωσ ἐπιτέλλεται, ἠνίκα περ γῆ

ἄνθεσιν εἰαρινοῖς θάλλει ἀεξομένη:
τῆμος Ἔρως προλιπὼν Κύπρον, περικαλλέα νῆσον,
εἶσιν ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους χάρμα φέρων κατὰ γῆν.

1275-1278

Love himself **riseth in due season**, when the earth swelleth and bloweth with the flowers of Spring; ay, then cometh **Love** from **Cyprus' beauteous isle** with joy for man throughout the world.

Contrast this with the seemingly more moderate φιλέω love which is expressed with “παιδοφιλεῖν”(1345-1350). Παιδοφιλεῖν, to hold beloved a youth, is given in the context of Zeus holding beloved Ganymede — so while erotic love is an externally visible sort of love, φιλέω may encompass a more private (maybe more physical as well) form of loving. We will be exploring φιλέω love later, but it was worth bringing in shortly to this discussion for the purpose of contrast.

What is generalizable about the concept of erotic love that the Theognidean poet is using? First, it may be worth mentioning that single words for Eros only exist twelve times in thirteen hundred eighty nine lines of Theognidean poetry, in ten poems. This too can be used to support the idea above that erotic love and those feelings and ideas exist only on the extremes, in places that one is not able to regularly visit without the meaning of the word being reduced. It is an idea that is particularly strong, and it is primarily used in the context of pederasty, ideas and themes of pederasty being found in nine of the ten poems in which erotic concepts are found.

Additionally, it would be a good idea for us to examine the social conditions within which Eros is the idea preferred to be represented. We have seen that Eros, as a noun, is used harkening back to Theseus and Troy (1231-1234), as a reference for a season (1275-1278), and as the object of a verb meaning “to make subject,” or “subdue,” (1345-1350 (δαμάζω takes the dative as evidenced in the Liddell-Scott Greek Lexicon)). The social context of Eros in reference to Troy being the Rape of Helen and the fall of Troy, and the poem stating that the cause of the fall of Troy was Eros the god makes Eros something that, if this Theognidean poem is intended didactically as many of them are, one should avoid. The social context then, of the poem, as opposed to within the poem, is that Eros is a force that will destroy one’s stability and cause violence for those who engage in it. As a season, the concept of erotic love as a noun anthropomorphizes and deifies the joys of Spring. The verb meaning “to make subject” or “to subdue,” δαμάζω, is alternatively used as a positive and as a negative. In 1341-1344, it is used in reference to a shame-bringing boy with whom one is erotically engaged. Yet in 1345-1350 it is used to represent the poet’s wonder at his being subdued with love by the good erotic object. However, in a social context among other prominent men in one’s city-state, any sexual submission would be a bad thing, as there were serious social consequences for not being the active partner sexually if one initiated into the elite.

The concept of erotic love as a verb is one that shames, causes grief among one’s friends, and exposes one in inappropriate ways socially; however, it

also makes the one who engages in it very happy temporarily, and is something towards which one is strongly motivated internally.

There is not an explicit, specific elite or middle or lower class perspective being represented in these poems. However, it was likely that the Theognidean poet was among the Megaran elite, as he was a poet, and since much of his poetry was delivered in symposia: an elite setting. Megara was near Athens (~30 miles) but a dependent of Corinth. Therefore, while verbal Eros does have some positive connotations, Eros's erstwhile negative noun forms stress strong themes not conducive to social comfort at an elite level. Thus, the social implications of Eros is not a positive one.

Eros occupies on the spectrum of love positions in the extremities, positions not only harmful to one's social station but also ones that one is sometimes forcibly driven to engage in. I would like to posit that Eros in the Theognidea is a social hindrance but also one of the more powerful components of a relationship in which feelings of love are explored. Desire in the Theognidean corpus is not explored with women in specifically erotic contexts, rather, she becomes more desirable by being a "good wife."

This leads us into the discussion of the presence of Aphrodite in the selected Theognidea. I will examine the grammatical functions of words relating to Aphrodite and why they are in those forms. The number of times the idea of

Aphrodite appears in the Theognidean corpus (11), what the contexts are, and what is generalizable. Further, I will examine what the social contexts of Aphrodite are in the selected poems. These selected poems are: 1275-1278, 1329-1334, 1337-1340; and I will be using 1283-1294, 1299-1304, 1305-1310, 1323-1326, 1329-1334, 1381-1382, 1383-1385, and 1386-1389 as supporting material.

Aphrodite is used as a noun in 1275-1278, 1323-1326, 1383-1385, and 1386-1389. When she is referred to as a noun, she is most frequently referred to as Cyprus-born (Κυπρογενής). When the poems use an adjectival form of her name, the reference is similar. She only once is referred to with her proper name (a noun), Ἀφροδίτη (1293). What is the purpose for her being referred to in a nounal form?

I posit that the presence of Aphrodite in 1275-1278 is a reference through the island of Cyprus being mentioned, whence Aphrodite came, and being the origin point from which Eros comes along with the spring- a definite pairing of themes speaking to rebirth which frequently includes sexual themes. In 1323-1326 she is propitiated and referenced (Κυπρογενής - Cyprus Born) as one with the power to change the minds of men, in 1383-1385 she is an agent who can deliver man from difficulties (Κυπρογενής - Cyprus Born), and in 1386-1389 she is one who inescapably overcomes the minds of men as the one

born in Cyprus. Thus it seems that Aphrodite is referred to in a nounal form for the purpose of speaking directly to her or to describe her.¹²

When we look at the descriptive Aphrodite, we can see more clearly what using her name as a descriptor of qualities means because of the way she has been described in noun forms. The LSJ defines descriptive Aphrodite as sexual love, pleasure; vehement longing or desire, enjoyment; beauty, grace, or charm. She is used to describe the sort of gift boys are given which make them attractive to their older sexual partners (1283-1294, 1299-1304 (Κυπρογενής), 1305-1310 (Κυπρογενής), 1329-1334 (Κυπρογενής), 1337-1340 (κυθερείης), 1381-1382 (Κυπρογενής), 1383-1385 (Κυπρογενής)). This gift is one that can change the minds of men, as a gift given to boys it may be a small amount less inescapable than when it is the goddess herself, but it is likely a gift that continues to overcome the minds of the men who are seduced by it.

Why does this analysis matter? As a noun, Aphrodite may be an agent, and as a descriptor, she becomes a way one may qualify the cause of an effect being felt. She may be an active agent, or the way things are described with reference to her may be active, but one may not feel in an Aphroditic fashion. Eros, as a god, becomes a verb because one may love like Eros. Aphrodite, however, is a god whose interactions with humans are defined by the effects she has, rather than the human emotional experience brought about by the way she interacts with humans.

¹² These poems and their translations can be found in the poetry appendix.

As with Eros, the ratio of occurrence of reference to Aphrodite to the total size/length of the Theognidea is very small. While Eros has 12 points of reference out of 1389 lines, Aphrodite has 11. Among the references to Aphrodite, 5 of the poems include a direct address to a boy, and the “gift of Aphrodite” occurs 7 times, sometimes with Aphrodite being described as violet-crowned (another descriptor for her is “well-girdled” which appears in 1337-1340).

What are some of the contexts of Aphroditic themes? With Eros’s contexts we began with the negative, so let us this time begin with the positive contexts. In poem 1275-1278 appear περικαλλέα and χάρμα- very beautiful and a source of joy. There exist in poem 1283-1294 two references to the qualities of Aphrodite- ίμερόεντα (exciting desire, lovely, charming) and χρυσῆς (golden). Poems 1299-1304 and 1329-1334 uses χάριν- joy, as does 1337-1340, in which there are also references to ideas of the poet being set free (ἐκλέλυμαι) of the Aphroditic longing (πόθου) and being well pleased (ἄσμενος). It is interesting here how the Erotic connotations in this poem, 1337-1340 are negative, but the Aphroditic references are positive.

Εὐφροσύνας (cheery, merry / mirth, merriment), as well as σωφροσύνης (soundness of mind, prudence, discretion) in poem 1323-1326 are both positive ideas that are mirrored with a brace of negatives, namely: πόνων, θυμοβόρους, and κακάς (work, heart-eating, and ill/ vice/ wickedness).

1323-1326

Κυπρογενή, παῦσόν με πόνων, σκέδασον δὲ μερίμνας
θυμοβόρους, στρέψον δ' αἰθίς ἐς εὐφροσύνας,
μερμήρας δ' ἀπόπαυε κακάς, δὸς δ' εὐφροني θυμῷ
μέτρ' ἤβης τελέσαντ' ἔργματα σωφροσύνης.

1323-1326

O Cyprus-born, end Thou my woes, scatter my carking cares, turn me again unto good cheer, make cease my evil imaginings, and grant me to accomplish the works of wisdom when I have fulfilled merrily the measure of Youth.

Another poem that has an interesting juxtaposition of positives and negatives is

1386-1389.

1386-1389

Κυπρογενὲς Κυθήρεια δολοπλόκε, σοί τι περισσὸν
Ζεὺς τόδε τιμήσας δῶρον ἔδωκεν ἔχειν:
δαμνᾶς ἀνθρώπων πυκινὰς φρένας, οὐδέ τίς ἐστίν
οὕτως ἴφθιμος καὶ σοφὸς ὥστε φυγεῖν.

1386-1388

Cyprus-born Cytherea, weaver of wiles, Zeus hath given Thee this gift because He honoureth Thee exceeding much — Thou overwhelmest the shrewd wits of men, nor lives the man so strong and wise that he may escape Thee.¹³

In this quatrain, Aphrodite is spoken of as being able to overcome men who are shrewd (πυκινὰς), stout (ἴφθιμος), and wise (σοφὸς). Why is her ability to overcome these men a positive? I would posit that this is a positive as a result of the way Aphrodite is described (in a general sense, not solely in this poem)- *pleasurable, desirable, enjoyable, and beautiful* all seem like positive characteristics to be overcome with. This conclusion looks towards a result of not all pains being negative things to experience, such as Aphroditic pains and nostalgia- the pain of return. However, she is also described as a weaver of wiles (δολοπλόκε) which is a stereotypically unpleasant way to refer to a female entity. (Sappho, 1.2)

¹³ J.M. Edmonds

Considering the negative contexts in which Aphrodite is found, 1305-1310 begins its negativity with a loosening (χάλασον) [a Homeric metaphor for death], being fettered (δεσμοῦ), constrained (βιήσεαι), the harmful/ difficult works of Aphrodite (ἔργων χαλεπῶν), and it ends with the noun meaning “evil,” “ill:” (κακότης).

Finally, Poem 1383-1385 in its two and a half lines refers to the gift of Aphrodite becoming for men one of the most difficult (χαλεπώτατον) burdens or loads (ἄχθος). The contrapositive to this being that although in this poem the gifts of Aphrodite are the most burdensome to man, she may also release them from difficulty (χαλεπῶν). The issue with this decreasing the potency of “greatest difficulty” (χαλεπώτατον) being that it is the positive form (χαλεπῶν), not the superlative form. Thus although an argument could be made that Aphrodite also takes away troubles, the difficulty she gives is more grievous than those which she takes away.

From what we have seen, it appears that to be described as Aphroditic, something is being described positively. The negatives seem to come about when there are ones refusing or resisting the effects of Aphrodite or one with the gift of Aphrodite. Those positives are: very beautiful, a source of joy, exciting desire/ lovely/ charming, golden, joy, being set free, being well pleased, cheery/ merry/ merriment, and soundness of mind/ prudence/ discretion. The negatives are: work, heart-eating, weaver of wiles, being fettered, being constrained, the harmful works of Aphrodite, ill, very difficult, and as a burden/ load. From the quantity of positives to negatives, not much can be drawn, and neither from the

degree, as both positives and negatives include superlatives. However, as Aphrodite in Theognidean poetry is a female (deity) in an elegiac context where the majority of sexual desire being expressed is towards other males, where the feminine is not equivalently erotic to the masculine, I posit that Aphrodite and Aphroditic descriptors are largely positive. The “gift of Aphrodite” is a quality that makes young men desirable. The support for Aphrodite and Aphroditic descriptors being a positive is based on the relative equitability of positive to negative descriptors of her effects. If Aphrodite was a largely negative thing, there would be, I believe, fewer and less potent positive references to the effects she has. Thus, Aphrodite and Aphroditic descriptors may be interpreted largely as positives. However, the presence of the admixture may reflect the pleasure and pain sexual desire brings about in humans.

What does this mean, along the scale of love that we have established with Eros at the extremes? It seems important to keep in mind at this point that Eros can function as a verb (as well as noun/ adjective/ participle/ adverb) while Aphrodite primarily occupies adjectival and nounal space. We have established that Aphroditic references may be interpreted as positives or negatives, but that I believe them to be largely positives. On the whole, it seems that the strictly positive references to Aphrodite occupy high positions on the scale of the way the Theognidean poet uses them. The negatives, likewise. Thus, while Erotic themes occupy the extremes, perhaps the Aphroditic themes occupy the next position towards moderation from the extremes. What are we able to generalize

from this? While Erotic love is an externally visible sort of love, Aphroditic modifiers seem to occupy internal emotional space. The internal effects are evidenced by being referred to in the positive as a source of joy (χάρμα), exciting desire (ἰμερόεντα), being well pleased (ἄσμενος), being cheery or as a merriment (εὐφροσύνας). These internally-oriented positives skew the interpretation of the negatives to be internally oriented as well. It is not difficult to see the negatives as internally oriented: weaver of wiles (δολοπλόκε), heart-eating (θυμοβόρους), a(n emotional) burden (ἄχθος), ill/ evil (κακάς)(frequently used to describe one's character in the Theognidea), being constrained (βιήσεται) or fettered (δεσμοῦ). This all seems to be evidence that Aphroditic modifiers and contexts are internal states of being as opposed to the Erotic being externally visible. This does not preclude the Aphroditic from being externally apparent, as the terms fettered (δεσμοῦ) and constrained (βιήσεται in the passive the implication is 'being forced' 'being the object of someone else's force') suggest- but these still occupy a less potent position on the scale than Eros.

As we have spoken to the what may be generalizable of the contexts in which Aphroditic modifiers are found, it is seemly to take a look at what is generalizable about why the Theognidean poet would choose to use Aphroditic references. As Eros was used sparingly because it was particularly strong and in pederastic contexts, Aphroditic references seem to occupy the same poetic space. These pederastic contexts are, as discussed, elite citizen male symposia and in broader society, where pederasty is used as a means by which elite

youths are initiated into elite society. As mentioned above, in nearly half of the contexts in which Aphrodite is found there is a direct address to a boy, and in seven of the eleven poems there is a boy (or other entity) being referenced by virtue of being described as having the “gift of Aphrodite.” These boys are the erotic objects of the poet, creating the pederastic implications previously referenced.

This leads us into the question of what the social contexts of Aphrodite are. We have seen a pederastic context being referenced with respect of Aphroditic social contexts. Additionally, with the states she causes being largely internal, there is not the social harm of being affiliated with the effects of Aphroditic causes, as there are with Erotic ones. Pederasty, however, is a social marker. It was primarily practiced among the elite. (Lanni, p50) The purpose of pederasty was to inculcate the youths who were engaging in it the values of the social group into which they were coming to be a member of, and this time and effort would have been impossible for citizen men who were of a lower station than the comparatively leisure class. Not all of the young men who were engaged in pederastic relationships were specifically engaging in them for an erotic purpose for the older man who was educating them. Frequently, the older elite men with whom these young men were engaging in sexual pederastic relationships with were not of the same social station as themselves. The erotic objects were citizens of lower station, slaves, or non-citizen residents of the city-state. The comparatively lower social, if not economic, class of the erotic object is also a result of the fact that the youth had not been initiated into elite society.

The social context of Aphroditic modifiers is indicative of an elite male's desire to justify or validate his sexual relationship with one who does not share his intrinsic social position, evidenced by describing these young men of lesser social station (1329-1334; where they are described as being honored by the attention of the poet who occupies a higher social status-the erotic object must needs keep in mind the social station of the poet, something not necessary if he was keeping his own social station in mind) as possessing the gift of a god in reference to attractiveness. This was evidenced by Athenian prostitution laws which prevented prostitutes, and more broadly, those who were penetrated for "gifts," such as pederastic erotic objects, from holding political position. (Lanni) Further, the boy (1341-1344) would be lesser inclined to damage the station of a social equal in whose circles he did not run if he were of equal station to the poet. Equally, the poet's friends would know of this boy and the relationship that he had with the poet were the boy to be of equal social station to the poet and his friends as a result of the shared social circles of the boy's father / family and the poet's friends. Thus, there would be a degree of social comfort with Aphroditic themes in an erotic object as Aphroditic states are largely internal, as opposed to the externally evident and harmful Erotic themes.

Aphrodite occupies a position that is neither extreme nor external. Her effects felt internally when refused or resisted are not so great that they cannot be overcome or dealt with. Aphrodite is a necessary part of erstwhile socially unacceptable relationships across class distinctions. The penetration of the youth

prevents him from becoming politically relevant (Lanni), as they were of equal economic, though not social (by virtue of the youth not having been initiated) station.

It is worth comparing the intra-poem word environments of Eros and Aphrodite in the selected poems. Eros and Aphrodite together are in three contexts, 1275-1278, 1329-1334, and 1337-1344. The latter two poems deal with real life situations in which the poet found himself; in the first the poet begs the boy to accept him, claiming him to have Aphrodite's gift; in the second he says that he no longer loves the boy and has escaped only by means of Aphrodite. The first brings them together so that their doubled effects are a more powerful seasonal image. But if instead we examine the way they are used, maybe we can gain more insight. Eros is more frequently used as a verb, and Aphrodite is not even referred to by her name, but as the one born from Cyprus or as the Cytherean (Κυπρογενὲς Κυθήρεια (1386-1389)). This leads me to believe that Aphrodite is a passive element, not a true agent, and Eros is active and an agent. In 1386-1388, the argument could be made that Aphrodite is an active agent, as "...Thou overwhelmest the shrewd wits of men...." Yet it is her gift that overwhelms the men:

...σοί τι περισσὸν
Ζεὺς τόδε τιμήσας δῶρον ἔδωκεν ἔχειν:
δαμνῆς ἀνθρώπων πυκινὰς φρένας...

...Zeus gave this gift having honored you to hold, so that you may overpower the shrewd minds of men...¹⁴

Thus it is her gift from Zeus that allows her to overcome the minds of men, not her innate characteristics or qualities.

We now will enter into a discussion on *Philos* relationships (friend, beloved) in the Theognidean corpus. To do so we will examine the grammatical functions of words relating to *Philos* (φίλος), and why their grammatical functions are important. Further, we will see that the idea of *Philos* appears in the Theognidea 128 times, as well as their contexts and what is generalizable about their contexts. Finally, we will examine the social contexts of *Philos* in the selected poems. These are: 1091-1094, 1267-1270, 1341-1344, 1345-1350, 1367-1368. Supporting material will come from poems 87-92, 93-100, 337-340, 351-354, 783-788, 869-872, 869-872, 873-876, 1082ξ-1082φ, 1091-1094, 1164α-1164δ, 1255-1256, 1267-1270, 1311-1318, 1345-1350, 1367-1368.

In the five selected poems, *Philos* appears as a verb five times (φιλέω), and a noun twice. Φιλέω is a verb means to treat affectionately or kindly, to welcome or entertain a guest, to regard with affection (of sexual intercourse), showing outward signs of love (kissing), to love/ be fond of/ be wont to/ used to (doing)(of things or events. LSJ). As a noun and adjective, *Philos* means: beloved, dear, friend, kith/ kin, ally, a descriptor of a lover, an object of love,

¹⁴ J.M. Edmonds

pleasant, welcome, one's own (limbs, life, etc), fond of/ attached to (LSJ). *Philos* differs from Erotic and Aphroditic themes and terms by virtue of not being a god. While Erotic love is an interpretation of the type of love incited by the god, and Aphroditic terms are qualities that are given by the god, *Philos* relationships or actions are not indicative of a deity's presence or activity. It is a strictly human sort of emotional engagement or relationship.

Thus, while *Eros* is expressed by naming the god, as a noun, and as a verb; while Aphrodite is expressed as a noun or adjective, *Philos* may be expressed in all the above ways. One may be described as a *Philos*, an agent may be a *Philos*, and one may express *Philos*-love for another. The result of these *Philos* terms not being inspired by a god is that they are intrinsically less strong than the previous two.

In the selected poems, *Philos* is expressed as a verb in 1091-1094, 1267-1270, 1345-1350, and 1367-1368 and it is expressed as a noun in 1091-1094 and 1341-1344.

The context of *Philos* in 1091-1094 is very specifically about friendship- that one may not be beloved by another if he does not will it, nor may he be hated if he is a friend. In this poem, there are frequent contrasts of *Philos* to *Ekthros* (hated). The verbal forms are used as epexigetical infinitives.

1091-1094

Ἀργαλέως μοι θυμὸς ἔχει περὶ σῆς φιλότητος:
οὔτε γὰρ ἐχθαίρειν οὔτε φιλεῖν δύνamai,
γινώσκων χαλεπὸν μὲν, ὅταν φίλος ἀνδρὶ γένηται,

ἐχθαίρειν, χαλεπὸν δ' οὐκ ἐθέλοντα φιλεῖν.

1091-1094

My heart is troubled for thy friendship; I can neither hate nor love, knowing that 'tis as hard to hate one that is become our friend as to be friends with one that wills it not.¹⁵

In 1267-1270, Φιλέω is used to complete the comparison of a boy in a series of pederastic relationships to a horse with alternating riders. It is used as a direct contrast to idea of the horse bearing as a rider (φέρει) to the Philos-love of a boy not being reserved, but being available for the one who is present.

In 1341-1344 nounal *Philos*, referring to the friends of the poet, is not a term that is speaking to the sexual desirability of those with whom he associates, however, it is present in the context of the poet being harmed socially by the boy whom he has Eros-love for.¹⁶ The poet's friends in 1341-1344 are not likely his close friends, but those with whom he associates regularly, the ones with whom he was familiar and of whom he was fond. Poem 1345-1350 turns the previous apparent friend-love of *Philos* into a more sexual sort of love with the term meaning, "to love boys" (παιδοφιλεῖν), which is referred to as a pleasure (τερπνόν). Here *Philos* is used as a term referring to sexual pederastic relationships with Ganymede and Zeus as this sort of relationship's paradigm.

¹⁵ J.M. Edmonds

¹⁶ The interesting note here is that *Philos* is the term the poet uses to describe his friends, as opposed to *Hetairos* (companion). Theognis 79-82, 87-92, and 93-100 for a quick example use *Hetairos* as opposed to *Philos* to represent a friend relationship that occupies a liminal space between positive and negative. It is one that seems too to occupy a space that is physically/ emotionally closer on either side of the positive/ negative spectrum than the more general term *Philos*.

Although a verb, in this context it is an infinitive, holding the role of a noun with an implied verb “to be.”

“To love boys is a pleasure...”

Finally, we examine poem 1367-1368, where *Philos* appears again as a verb.

This is an interesting poem because it is a point of contrast with one of the previous poems, 1267-1270, as it describes joy as belonging to a boy companion as opposed to a female non-citizen, unmarried companion with whom there is not fidelity, she loving him who is present.

1367-1368

παιδός τοι χάρις ἐστί, γυναικὶ δὲ πίστις ἑταίρη
οὐδεμί', ἀλλ' αἰεὶ τὸν παρέοντα φιλεῖ.

1367-1368

Gratitude belongeth, 'tis sure, to a lad; but a woman-comrade is never true; she loveth him that is present unto her.¹⁷

Verbal *Philos* is also, in this comparison, in the same position as in 1267-1270, as the last word of the poem. It is also in both cases preceded by the term meaning “one being present” (παρέοντα). Apart from the interesting points these last two statements have been, they also expose to a degree the way a *Philos* relationship is seen by the Theognidean poet. One without agency in poetry has *Philos* relationships with anyone who is present, as opposed to the poet and others with agency whose *Philos* relationships exist beyond the distance of eyesight. These entities without agency too have no care in their minds for those with whom they previously have had *Philos* relationships. Much like the

¹⁷ J.M. Edmonds

boy and the horse taking new riders when their former one is thrown in the metaphorical dust, after being sated with the other physical desires (eating), and the woman holding in a *Philos* relationship the one present (as opposed to the one with whom the poet thinks she ought to be faithful), they are not represented as thinking twice about their lack of fidelity.

Now that we have spoken about the contexts of *Philos* in the selected poems of the Theognidea, it seems an appropriate time to discuss why the grammatical functions of *Philos* in these poems is significant. It seems reasonable to work our way from the verbs to the nouns, in poems where they appear singly to the poems where they appear multiple times.

In 1267-1270, 1345-1350, and 1367-1368 the idea of *Philos* love appears, and in 1267-1270 and 1367-1368 it is used in the final position of the poem as the verb upon which the main idea of the poem lies, to emphasize it. Were the idea of *Philos* to be represented in a different grammatical form, such as a participle (a descriptive way to express action), it could be indicative of being less forceful, the poet may be less impacted by the boy's and the woman's emotional infidelity. In 1345-1350 the verbal idea of *Philos*, as an interesting juxtaposition, occupies the first position in the poem as the first word of the first line. Why does this matter? In opposition to the previous examples, where the idea of the poem rested on verbal *Philos*, boy love (παιδοφιλεῖν) is the idea upon which a commentary is being made, and where the pivotal idea of love is not *Philos*, but *Eros*. Important too to note, that as *Philos* here is a verb, it implies a more sexual relationship than a nounal form of *Philos*. The LSJ refers παιδοφιλέω (to love

boys) to παιδεραστέω (to be a lover of boys). This is significant because a παιδεραστής (a lover of boys) is much like an έραστής (a pursuing lover) to an έρώμενος (one being loved/ pursued sexually) in his relationship to a παῖς (boy). Thus, verbal *Philos*, as sexual love, appears as a verb in the selected poems for the purpose of emphasizing the importance to the poet and the sexual nature of the relationships being described.

Nounal *Philos* appears in 1341-1344 (φίλοισιν), where the significance of *Philos* as a noun is relevant to its interpretation. As a noun, it means “friends” referring to the friends of the poet, in front of whom he is embarrassed. As previously stated, a nounal *Philos* is likely not a reference to someone with whom one is close, but instead with whom one is familiar.

Finally, in 1091-1094 *Philos* is represented as both a noun (φίλος) and as a verb (φιλέω). In 1091 and 1093, *Philos* appears as a noun. In 1092 and 1094 *Philos* appears as a verb. Pairing ideas of not-by-necessity sexual friendship with sexual friendship is a somewhat strange thing to do, unless the poet is suggesting that those with whom one has *Philos* relationships are also those with whom one engages in sexual relationships. This is supported by the pairing of παιδοφιλέω and έράω in 1345-1350. *Eros* relationships are not by necessity sexual, but it is starting to appear that in *Philos* relationships, something more than platonic friendship is being suggested.

The concept of *Philos* appears 128 times in the Theognidean corpus. We will be looking at the contexts of *Philos* in the selected poems, as they speak

more closely to the eroticism we are looking for in the Theognidean corpus and because there are too many examples and too many interpretations to give them all justice.

In 1091-1094, the erstwhile context is the words: painful, troublesome (ἀργαλέος), the inner will/ spirit (θυμός), to be willing/ to want (ἐθέλω), and difficult (χαλεπός). I intentionally do not include: to hate/ detest (ἐχθαίρω)- as the poem trends positively, talking about why it is difficult to hate, as opposed to the poet saying that he hates someone (see quote above). The *Philos* relationship that the poet has with the object of 1091-1094 is causing pain in the poet's spirit (ἀργαλέος, θυμός), but the poet says that it is difficult (χαλεπός) for the one who he is engaged in a *Philos* relationship with to become estranged (ἐχθαίρω) as it is for one to be a friend with someone whom wishes (ἐθέλω) not one's friendship. This is a positive as a result of it being a plea from the poet to his erotic object with whom he has a *Philos* relationship to maintain the *Philos* relationship.

The context of 1267-1270 includes: a horse (ἵππος) whose mind weeps not (οὔτε... κλαίει) for having unceremoniously and violently removed his rider, bearing (φέρει) another man just as a boy loves another being nearby (παρεόντα). Here is a fairly strong negative context- there exist no intrinsically negative words, weeping is not a bad thing, but part of a grief process. That the unfaithful one is not weeping may be indicative of further negativity- it is not even an action that has attendant difficulty to make.

The context of 1341-1344 is revealing (ἐκφαίνει), not desiring (οὐκ ἐθέλοντος), and the phrase, “I will not suffer many hidden violences against my will,” (τλήσομαι οὐ κρύψας ἀκούσια πολλὰ βίαια). The context being left out is perhaps the most important, and that is the friends, those with whom the poet has *Philos* relationships with and in front of whom his erotic object is embarrassing him. This poem is negative, as a secret worth keeping is being let out into the open. However, it is being let out among his friends. This is worth being taken into account, because this suggests that the social damage being done to the poet by his erotic object exposing him is relatively mitigated by comparison to what it could be if it was let out among his peers or enemies.

In poem 1345-1350, the context inclusively of loving of boys (Παιδοφιλεῖν) is: enjoyment (τερπνόν), being loved erotically (ἠράσατο; ἔραμαι), and being a flower (ἄνθος) found to be erotically pleasing (ἐρατόν). Despite the fact that the poet is defending himself to one of his peers for his pederastic love, the phrasal environment the poet constructs is a positive one.

In poem 1367-1368, the phrasal context is comprised primarily of joy (χάρις), of a young man and “not one (is) faithful” (πίστις... οὐδεμί) in reference to the female companion.

The contexts in which the idea of *Philos* in the selected Theognidea is found, then, are ones that occupy a moderate position, and fairly equally represented on both sides of the spectrum. Thus if Erotic love occupies the extreme wings of the spectrum of love, and Aphroditic themes of love occupy the next level towards the median, that leaves *Philos* love which seems to occupy a

moderate, internal stance towards love. However, when expressed externally it amounts to physical intimacy. I avoid saying “sex” because if a *Philos* relationship is one felt internally, it would follow that there would be an emotional engagement when one physically brought that relationship to some sort of fruition.

It seems appropriate to think about the linguistic environment in which the poet was operating, as that environment’s interpretation of *Philos* love would be seen in the way the poet chose to use the concept of *Philos* love. The term linguistic environment I define here as meaning the familiar and colloquial diction which is used in the social group to which the poet identifies, the social conditions and stations of those involved in creating performance and social space. In all of the selected poems where *Philos* love is used there is also reference to a boy. Erotic and Aphroditic themes occupied progressively less potent positions on the scale of strength of terms used to describe love, and both were fairly overtly pederastic. However, I believe the label “pederastic” to be insufficient to grasp what the poet intended. Poetic pederastic contexts, and even a context with a woman (1367-1368) is a context with an erotic object who is depicted as having no real agency, poetically, as the erotic object has no voice. Earlier, we established that *Philos* relationships were likely among those with whom one was familiar, one’s household. One’s household as an Archaic Greek member of the elite was largely composed of slaves. As a result, those with whom one has *Philos* relationships do not exercise agency.

We may generalize certain of things about why *Philos* was chosen in its contexts by the poet. Keeping in mind that with 128 occurrences in the Theognidean corpus, it is used more than ten times as often as Eros, and more than eleven times more frequently than Aphrodite. *Philos* occupies a more moderate position on the spectrum of love. Erotic themes are externally felt and externally expressed. Aphroditic themes are externally expressed but internally felt. *Philos* is too externally expressed, but internally felt. But as it is not inspired by a god, it is the way to express humanity and human emotional states, human physical expression of love. It must needs occupy a lesser potency as it is not affiliated with one's will being overcome, but it is the expression of one's will.

What are the social contexts, therefore, of *Philos* relationships? *Philos* relationships are taking place between people who are familiar with one another, one's household, one's neighbors, one's community. As a social marker, *Philos* is present not only with the elite in a general sense. The poet's usage of *Philos* in the Theognidea is representative, perhaps, of his desire to make his content approachable and relatable, occurring within socially acceptable bounds.

While Erotic and Aphroditic themes overpower and overwhelm boundaries, as gods are not subject to the limits of man, *Philos* themes are. Using a *Philos* relationship allows the poet to create a relatable environment for which his didactic purpose finds a home.

It is worth a moment to consider which ideas of love— *Eros*, *Philos*, or Aphroditic—speak about which types of objects: Man, Woman, or Boy. Erotic love, we have found, speaks primarily to a pederastic love of elite male to non-elite young man, poetically described as having limited agency. Aphroditic themes exist in the same pederastic contexts, but they occupy a position less socially transgressive than Erotic themes. They are strongly felt internally, but their external expression does not cause an elite citizen to transgress, instead it is the transgression of upward social mobility found in lower class youths with good looks. *Philos* love, as an idea, is present in one who has a relationship of familiarity or particularly close friendship with another. *Philos* love as it physically manifests itself in the world is realized in the act of physical intimacy. So far as I can tell thus far, Erotic and Aphroditic forms of love do not require any physical action to take place for them to reach a conclusion; a conclusion, which if we can use the Theognidean corpus as a guide with which to make commentary, leaves the poet in despair with his erotic object leaving him for another. However, in 1091-1094, the Theognidean poet makes it clear that it is far more difficult to take leave of a *Philos* relationship than the previously mentioned Erotic relationship. Also worth mentioning is the fact that a *Philos* relationship may more easily take place with the erstwhile poetically marginalized, as is evidenced by the woman in 1367-1370 being an agent who chooses whom she will love. *Philos* love is accessible and real for the Theognidean poets' audience.

Now that we have examined Erotic, Aphroditic, and Filotic love, perhaps it is time to turn our attention to that which contrasts these themes. "Ἐχρα means "hate," does not appear very often in the selected Theognidean poems, but I believe that it speaks to the way that the poet understands eroticism and relationships on a qualitative level. The poems among the selected corpus that utilize themes of hate are 579-584 and 1091-1094. We will, however, bring in other examples from the whole of the corpus. We will examine the grammatical functions of words relating to hate, and why they are used in such ways grammatically. Further, we will examine how many times "Ἐχρα (hate) occurs in the corpus (19 nounal/adjectival; 9 verbal-inclusive of the selected corpus), in what contexts they appear, and what is generalizable from this. We will ask what the sexual contexts of hate are in the poems. Finally, we will make a comparison of the way *Ekthros* is presented as opposed to the themes of love.

Here, we will be seeking specifically a greater understanding of the usage of hate as a theme used by the Theognidean poet, for the purpose of understanding the space within which the Theognidean poet understands eroticism to happen. Ἐχθαίρω (hate, detest) occurs four times in the selected poems, but it also has substantive and adjectival forms extant in the broader corpus.

In the whole of the Theognidean corpus, in every instance where *Ekthros* exists as a verb, it is in a poem of four lines or longer. In 579-584, *Ekthros* occupies verbal space. Detestation/ hatred as an action in which one may engage. This is not any sort of hate, however, it is performed in the first person, by a single person. “I detest, I hate,” says ἐχθαίρω. The entities who have the ability to speak in poetry are frequently limited to the poet, and the entities who have the ability to act are frequently limited to acts of refusal of erotic advances or separation. The poet does not use verbal *Ekthros* in the first person in reference to himself. So when we know that at least one of the voices in 579-584 is not the poet by virtue of being a female¹⁸, it necessarily changes the way that we start interpreting the ability to speak in poetry in reference to spoken refusal, in addition to the ability to act in poetry in reference to the act of refusal. Refusal, separation, and detestation/ hatred seem to be one of the standards of granting momentary poetic agency to entities that are not the poet; the disenfranchised, one might say. As a verb, as well, ἐχθαίρω does more than express a stance. One may say that such a person is one’s enemy, but one need not use the verb “to hate” or “to detest” to do so. So by virtue of using a verbal form, the poet, or the voice with agency, declares the way he/she feels. This declaration uses, furthermore, the present (I hate, I am hating) and the indicative (concrete fact) forms to emphasize the point being made further.

¹⁸ So when the poet says, “I hate an evil man,” it is not he that speaks, but a woman. Suddenly, the tone of the first couplet changes entirely, a female agent expressing displeasure with an evil man tacitly expresses pleasure with a good man, one that she has at home or in mind. (Close Reading Appendix)

In 1091-1094, verbal *Ekthros* appears as infinitives.

1091-1094

My heart is troubled for thy friendship; I can neither hate nor love, knowing that 'tis as hard to hate one that is become our friend as to be friends with one that wills it not.

They are verbs taking substantival nounal roles. Instead of saying “I hate,” as ἐχθαίρω does, ἐχθαίρειν: “to hate.” For example, “...For I am able neither to love nor to hate...” (1092). In this and the other occurrence in this poem, ἐχθαίρειν follows the verb. Verb infinitives may occupy many different spaces grammatically, and among them, nounal space as well. Taking a nounal role, it further becomes a direct object of the verbs with which it interacts, an accusative. In this context, the important thing to remember is that this is poetry written by a poet. If the poet wishes to represent the idea of friendship, he can choose to use the verb φιλεῖν or the noun φιλότης. The same happens with hatred/enmity, he can use the verb ἐχθαίρειν or the noun ἔχθρα. Apart from metrical concerns, the difference between using a noun and a verb to represent the same idea in poetry seems to me to have a few reasonable purposes. The first being that the idea is most clearly represented by the verbal form, especially given that the poem would be performed verbally and the audience would have processed it auditorially. This is partially a result of the nounal form being a derivative of the verbal form. Another reason may be a desire for euphony. φιλότης has the unvoiced, un-aspirated glottal stop that makes the “t” sound, while ἔχθρα does not. This means that one would in the word φιλότης hear a “t” sound as in the word “tee.” But in the word “ἔχθρα,” there is not a “t” sound, or any of its iterations. Instead, there is the “k” sound aspirated, so that it would be

transliterated as a “kh,” denoting that the sound being made when pronouncing that letter amounts nearly to simply the sound of breath leaving one’s mouth, like the “h” in “house.” However, both ἐχθαίρειν and φιλεῖν have the typical infinitive ending of -εῖν. Furthermore, by virtue of using the verb, one must intrinsically place more stress on “to hate” as it occupies a greater syllabic footprint than “to love;” however, if one used the nounal forms, greater stress for the same reason would be placed on “friendship” as opposed to “hatred.”

From the rest of the corpus, substantival *Ekthros* occurs 19 times, 13 of which occur within a context that includes substantival or verbal *Philos*. I will examine three couplets wherein *Ekthros* contrasts with *Philos*, for the purpose of divining the actual relationship between the two ideas in a relatively isolated poetic environment. These poems are 1079-1080, 1219-1220, and 1318A-1318B.

1079-1080
οὐδένα τῶν ἐχθρῶν μωμήσομαι ἐσθλὸν ἐόντι,
οὐδὲ μὲν αἰνήσω δειλὸν ἐόντα φίλον.

1079-1080
I will blame no enemy that is a good man, nor yet praise a friend that is bad.¹⁹

An *Ekthros* is a personal enemy. This does not (clearly) keep that individual from being a good person. Nor is a friend by necessity defined as a good person. The poet then identifies a difference between being agreeable to another and being in accordance with social norms and limits. In my opinion, this creates a stronger contrast between the ideas of *Ekthros* and *Philos*. If one need not be good to be a *Philos*, this tells us that one does not necessarily choose those with whom one

¹⁹ J.M. Edmonds

engages in *Philos* relationships. It also tells us that if one need not be bad to be an *Ekthros*, one does not necessarily choose those with whom one engages in *Ekthros* relationships. This creates greater contrast by virtue of the social roles having been born into, and thus are not likely or necessarily able to be changed.

In the previous couplet, we had a glimpse into *Ekthros/Philos* relationships, that they are what they are not necessarily by one's own actions, but by virtue of being. In this couplet, we will be exploring these relationships when they become active within their own contexts.

1219-1220

ἐχθρῷ μὲν χαλεπὸν τὸν δυσμενῆ ἔξαπατήσαι
Κύρνε, φίλον δὲ φίλῳ ῥάδιον ἔξαπατᾶν.

1219-1220

It is difficult for an enemy to deceive his foe, Cyrnus, but easy for a friend to deceive his friend.²⁰

While in the previous couplet, *Ekthros* and *Philos* were placed in relation to qualifiers of bad and good, no such statement of quality is being put forth by the poet in 1219-1220. Instead, he places each into its own context. Another difference being that in this instance he makes each entity, the *Ekthros* and the *Philos*, active. The poem states that if one views another as an enemy, it will be difficult for that person to deceive them. That is, if one views another as a friend, it will be easy for that person to deceive him. I cannot help but return to the idea of one with whom another holds a *Philos* relationship being one with whom that other is familiar or used to. As a result, an *Ekthros* relationship by necessity must be a relationship where the two parties are not familiar with, or used to, one another. With one whom one is not familiar, deception is difficult- one is looking

²⁰ J.M. Edmonds

for it regularly and at every turn. With one with whom one is familiar, deception is easier- one knows the habits the target engages in, their biases, how far one can stretch the facts to keep them believable. Thus we are further discovering noulal *Ekthros* as being flavored by the fact that one does not frequently know well those with whom they have *Ekthros* relationships.

In the previous two poems, we bring generalities to the table. However, in 1318A-1318B, the message is more personal.

1318α-1318β

ὦ μοι ἐγὼ δειλός: καὶ δὴ κατάχαρμα μὲν ἐχθροῖς
τοῖς δὲ φίλοισι πόνος δεινὰ παθῶν γενόμεν.

1318A-1318B

O miserable me! become I am a joy unto mine enemies and a vexation to my friends because of my sufferings.²¹

Although what we have gleaned is that an *Ekthros* is not a close personal relationship, that it is frequently brought about by factors outside of one's own control, it is worth remembering that these people who are the ones with whom one engages in *Ekthros* relationships are still one's enemies, they are still hated or detested. Thus this couplet highlights that despite the somewhat impersonal nature of certain among *Ekthros* relationships, these relationships are essentially negative feedback loops, where distaste and detestation are the norm. If they were not to be engaged in, there would be greater confusion, as those are the emotions which it is socially acceptable to engage with one's *Ekthros* in. This poem shows that those with whom the poet is engaged in *Ekthros* relationships with gaining enjoyment by his suffering-a relationship that would only occur

²¹ J.M. Edmonds

between parties that held distaste for one another. The limit then, between *Philos* and *Ekthros* relationship is the line between liking another and having distaste for another. (See poem above)

Important to note, these explorations have concerned the nounal *Ekthros*. Thus we have defined nounal *Ekthros* as being a distasteful, hateful quantity; one that is not necessarily personal, and represents a relationship outside of which one may be seen in the qualifying light it warrants through his conduct. We also established that verbal *Ekthros* is used to give voice to those who in poetry would not normally have a voice, and that it is used to emphasize an emotional state.

With an understanding of the way the Theognidean poet used *Ekthros*, it would here be worthwhile to examine its frequency in the corpus, in what contexts it appears, and what may be derived from this. *Ekthros* appears in the Theognidean corpus a total of twenty eight times, nineteen of which are nounal or adjectival, and nine of which are verbal, these numbers inclusive of the selected poems. Taking what we have recently considered about the purpose of a nounal or verbal form of *Ekthros* as used by the Theognidean poet, we may begin to better understand the contexts in which these are found. In addition to the two examples of verbal usage in the selected corpus of Theognidean poetry, there will be three examples of substantival usage from poems 87-92, 337-340, and 811-814.

Hate, much like love, cannot exist in a vacuum, just as good and evil cannot. Understanding the contexts in which it happens allows us to understand

it, much like the context of a praise or curse does. With verbal *Ekthros*, 579-584, the context is: evil (κακὸν), veiled (καλυψαμένη), a woman running around (γυναῖκα περιδρομον), and a field tilled by another (ἀλλοτρίην... ἄρουραν ἀροῦν)(see discussion on this theme in this poem's specific analysis in the close reading appendix). These terms are negative ones, hating them, it would seem, is socially sanctioned. The exception in this poem being the term veiled (καλυψαμένη), as it is a socially acceptable response to the evil man (κακὸν) for whom distaste is being expressed (ἐχθαίρω).

In 1091-1094, the context is more complex. Pain (Ἄργαλέως), ability (δύναμαι), cognizance (γινώσκων), and difficulty (χαλεπὸν). This poem is a snare; hate and familiar love being entwined so closely, it is difficult to wrangle out the context for the hate as separate as the context for the love. I choose these terms because I believe that they provide insight into the social factors that would cause one to hate another in the Theognidean corpus. Friendship becomes a pain when one is not wishing to be loved like a friend. The pain, expressed by the adverb Ἄργαλέως is what becomes distasteful, the poet not knowing where the object of the poem lies in his social environment. But nor can he hate, knowing (γινώσκων) the difficulty (χαλεπὸν) of hating a friend. Hate here exists in a greater context than distaste for negative themes. It is speaking to social transgression, the becoming of enemy from friend and friend from enemy. Hate, it would seem, when an activity, is not only about something negative, but also about transgression. The boundaries here are between familiar

and unfamiliar. It is distasteful, then, for one to transgress by crossing that boundary.

Now as we turn our attention to the contexts of substantival *Ekthros*, let us keep in mind that the *Ekthros* we have already examined is indicative of the entity to which it is referring being a quantity unfamiliar to the agent. In 87-92, the context is: two minds (δίχ' νόον), one tongue (μιῆ γλώσση), a comrade (ἑταῖρος), and a friend (φίλος).

87-92

μή μ' ἔπαινον μὲν στέργε νόον δ' ἔχε καὶ φρένας ἄλλη,
εἴ με φιλεῖς καὶ σοὶ πιστὸς ἔνεστι νόος,
ἀλλὰ φίλει καθαρὸν θέμενος νόον, ἢ μ' ἀποσιπῶν
ἔχθαιρ' ἀμφαδίην νεῖκος ἀειρώμενος.
ὃς δὲ μιῆ γλώσση δίχ' ἔχει νόον, οὗτος ἑταῖρος
δεινός, Κύρην', ἐχθρὸς βέλτερος ἢ φίλος ὢν.

87-92

If thou lovest me and the heart within thee is loyal, be not my friend but in word, with heart and mind turned contrary; either love me with a whole heart, or disown me and hate me in open quarrel. Whosoever is in two minds with one tongue, he, Cynrus, is a dangerous comrade, better as foe than friend.²²

Verbal *Ekthros* appears in this poem, but it appears in a context that we may easily say is transgressive. The entities in this poem is not entirely unfamiliar, but the stance of their heart and mind is not known to the poet. And by virtue of being of two minds and one tongue, the entity cannot be welcomed into a Philos relationship. That entity is transgressive, and by virtue of its transgression, the poet counsels that one make that entity an *Ekthros*- one with whom one is unfamiliar. If one does not make that entity unfamiliar, he will, the poet suggests, transgress.

²² J.M. Edmonds

Poem 337-340's context follows, "(Enemies) having been proved (ἐχθρῶν...δυνησαμένων) better (μείζον), and a request of Zeus to give what is meet (Ζεύς... δοίη). If the poet is asking Zeus to repay to his enemies proved greater than himself, this implies that one's quality of goodness is separate socially than one's quality of being an *Ekthros*.

337-340

Ζεὺς μοι τῶν τε φίλων δοίη τίσιν οἷ με φιλεῦσιν,
τῶν τ' ἐχθρῶν μείζον, Κύρνε, δυνησαμένων:
χοῦτως ἂν δοκέοιμι μετ' ἀνθρώπων θεὸς εἶναι,
εἴ μ' ἀποτεισάμενον μοῖρα κίχῃ θανάτου.

337-340

Zeus grant me to repay the friends that love me, and mine enemies that have proved stronger than I; then shall I seem a God among men, if the destiny of death overtake me with all paid.²³

If one's enemy is an entity with whom one is in positions counter to oneself, this does not preclude that individual from being a good person. An enemy is not by necessity an evil quantity. Worth noting too is that the word greater (μείζον) is indicative of a variety of things in the Archaic Greek mind. Among these are better looking, of a higher social station, with more achievements or accomplishments. One's quality of goodness is as dependent on the way one is viewed by the social body politic as one's quality of being an enemy is dependent on the fact that one occupy a position counter to one's own.

The final poem is 811-814, whose context is: betrayal by ones' friends (φίλοι προὔδωκαν), approaching one's enemies (πελασθεῖς), and grievous pain (ἀνιηρότατον). The poet says that the fate worse than death is to be betrayed by his friends, and that being brought near his enemies he will now judge their wits. The friends by virtue of betrayal, being ones with whom one is familiar are

²³ J.M. Edmonds

among the enemies that the poet now approaches having transgressed against him. He approaches them because they are the ones with whom one interacts frequently, and their status as enemies does not replace this fact immediately. This pain of transgression and betrayal is described in superlative terms (ἀνιηρότατον).

We may thus make the following generalizations about *Ekthros* relationships that include occupying personal and impersonal emotional space. Common themes of nounal *Ekthros* are concerned with transgression having happened upon the agent or the entity with whom one is engaged in an *Ekthros* relationship—this individual being opposed to the agent. Furthermore, *Ekthros* relationships span a good deal of space along the spectrum of moderation to extremity. Betrayal is a powerful term to cause an *Ekthros* relationship to begin, but others with whom the poet has *Ekthros* relationships the poet says are better than himself. Understanding the meaning of an *Ekthros* relationship between two entities then is dependent upon the context of their engagement in such a relationship.

What are the sexual implications of hate, and what is generalizable about why the poet would use *Ekthros* to describe a relationship he has with another person? I think poem 579-584 is particularly indicative of hate having sexual implications.

579-582

ἐχθαίρω κακὸν ἄνδρα, καλυψαμένη δὲ πάρειμι
σμικρῆς ὄρνιθος κοῦφον ἔχουσα νόον.
ἐχθαίρω δὲ γυναῖκα περίδρομον, ἄνδρα τε μάργον
ὃς τὴν ἀλλοτρίην βούλετ' ἄρουραν ἀροῦν.

She: I hate an evil man, and having been veiled I pass by,
keeping my mind light as a little birds'.

He: And I hate a woman running around,
and a madman who another's field wishes to plough.

In 579-584, the female hates the evil man who is at once beneath her social station and at once causing her to need to veil herself, implying that he has designs upon her. She, as a result of her distaste, avoids a sexual relationship with the one that she detests. When the poet says that he detests an evil man, there is a pre-existing context within which his displeasure has been circumscribed. However, it is not the male poet that is speaking herein presently. Instead, the voice in the poem's first couplet is that of a woman. "καλυψαμένη," and "ἔχουσα" are both feminine participles, indicating that a woman is speaking. So when the poet says, "I hate an evil man," it is not he that speaks, but a woman. Suddenly, the tone of the first couplet changes entirely, a female agent expressing displeasure with an evil man tacitly expresses pleasure with a good man, one that she has at home or in mind. The opposite of hate or detestation being love or adoration, and this in connection with a man who is not κακὸν remains in the listener's mind. This could be a cause of such an act being a social transgression. Furthermore, the man in the following couplet hates a woman who is sexually promiscuous, and a man who has sex with another's erotic object. The man now avoids sexual relationships with a female who

transgresses as well as with other men who transgress. We may further generalize certain things about the way the poet uses *Ekthros* to describe certain types of relationships.

The Theognidean poet frequently pairs themes of *Ekthros* and of *Philos*. Whereas Eros had 12 occurrences in the corpus, Aphrodite 11, and *Philos* 128, *Ekthros* has 28- it occupies greater space than transgressive (Eros-inspired) love but substantially less than human love. From this we may divine that one engages in *Ekthros* relationships less frequently than in *Philos* relationships. From this too we may divine that the poet engages in fewer transgressive or unfamiliar relationships than in transgressive or unfamiliar relationships. Further nounal *Ekthros* occupies external expression- there are factors in the world that cause two entities to be at cross purposes; verbal *Ekthros* exists in internal feeling that causes action, but action that still primarily occupies the individual level. The woman, hating the evil man, veils herself as opposed to acting upon the man. The man who hates the promiscuous woman does not take action against her, nor does he take action against the man who has sex with others' erotic objects.

We will now compare the way *Ekthros* and themes of love are presented. Two of the three types of love are transgressive. Engaging in an *Ekthros* relationship is not by necessity transgressive, since even when one actively engages in hate, one is not by necessity taking action against the hated party. *Ekthros* relationships occupy moderate to strong positions along the spectrum of

distaste for another, while each type of love seems to have its own niche. *Ekthros* relationships appear less frequently than themes of love do, but more frequently than both divinity-inspired forms combined. But *Ekthros* relationships are not used in the context of Eros or Aphroditic themes-only with Philos.

Themes of *Ekthros* then are not divinely inspired but caused by human interaction, much the way Philos relationships are with their brand of love. Thus human transgression caused by human action is grounds for hate, but human transgression caused by divine action is not.

Presently we will examine the idea of the Boy in the Theognidean corpus, specifically the term “boy” (παῖς, παιδός) in association with erotic relationships. We will examine the grammatical functions of words relating to boy and what the purpose of such constructions is. Finally, we will examine the social contexts of Boy in the poems. The poems we will be examining are: 1267-1270, 1329-1334, 1335-1336, 1337-1340, 1341-1344, 1345-1350, and 1367-1368.

Boy (παῖς) is a noun, and as we start examining the grammatical function of the different forms of nounal Boy, we will look specifically at the functional differences between nominative and oblique cases of Boy. As a part of looking at these differences, we will be further examining whether the oblique cases are direct or indirect objects, or whether they are genitives. Finally, the context of

nounal Boy (παῖς) will be examined in reference to other nouns indicative of a gender difference.

In 1267-1270, 1329-1334, and 1337-1340, Boy appears in nominative position.²⁴ Although Boy occupies nominative position in 1267-1270, it is not the primary subject of the sentence/ poem which is also a metaphor. This is because horse (ἵππος) occupies the other nominative position that is the primary subject of the metaphor. In 1329-1334, the boy is directly addressed with the adjectival modifier of good-looking (καλῆ), which is defined (LSJ) as being a modifier of external appearance, degree of quality, and in a moral sense. By being a vocative, the boy addressed in the second person (παῖ) is the subject of the verbs of the sentence, although the Theognidean poet speaks in the first person. This is all paralleled in 1337-1340, with the exception of the boy (παῖ) not being attributed a quality with an adjectival modifier.

In 1335-1336, 1337-1340, 1341-1344, 1345-1350, and 1367-1368, Boy appears in oblique position. This is broken up by an occurrence of Boy in 1335-1336 and 1341-1344 being the only non-genitive oblique usages, where it is an indirect object. Thus beginning with 1335-1336, Boy as an indirect object modified by good-looking (καλῶ) tells the reader with whom the blest man is sleeping all day. In 1341-1344, Boy as an indirect object reveals by which agent the poet was overcome.

²⁴ I am including the nounal case indicative of direct address into nominative position as it occupies the same space in English. However, the case indicative of direct address may belong to any case, as it is not syntactically linked to any other part of the phrase or sentence.

In 1337-1340, the verb to love Erotically (ἐράω) takes the genitive case. It is a verb that takes a specific case (genitive) as its direct object. In 1345-1350, the genitive position is held by the beautiful boy (καλοῦ παιδός) because it modifies the love (ἔρωτι) with which the poet is speaking of being overwhelmed (“I was revealed being overcome with love for a beautiful boy.”). In 1367-1368, genitive Boy is being used partitively, “There is favor for you from a boy...,” meaning that part of the favor that there is for the subject of the couplet comes from a boy.

The purpose of the grammatical forms that Boy is used in is indicative of the way that a pederastic erotic object (ἐρώμενος) is understood to not have agency.

We have spoken of agency in reference to the nominative or oblique usage of nouns granted by the poet to the nouns themselves. While with Man and Woman, nominative forms equated to greater degrees of agency (see appendices on Man and Woman), this does not hold true with Boy (in the selected corpus). The purpose of placing in the nominative position Boy is to reference his existence or to directly address him. They are not that subject which affects the verb in the phrase or sentence or poem. Boy, then, as a pederastic erotic object, does not occupy a position of agency. Further, with obliquely used Boy, this is further emphasized. From the subject of 1335-1336 being told that sleeping with a beautiful boy will make him happy, to there being described grace from the Boy being present in 1367-1368, truly the most agency

that Boy receives in the selected corpus is in 1341-1344, where the Boy is the direct object of the poets' *Eros* love. But this is still a pittance as Erotic love causes the erotic pursuer to transgress socially and the Boy is not necessarily even involved in the *Eros* love being felt by the poetic voice.

Several times the Theognidean poet says that he is being exposed or revealed in a shameful light for his love of a Boy, the poetic voice is still the one that affects the verb. He speaks of himself in a passive voice in order to do so. "I was revealed..." (1350) by comparison to, "I reveal..." passive and active voice verbal constructions respectively. The poet is being acted upon by an external agent by virtue of his usage of the passive voice. However, in the 1341 poem, the boy is the one who reveals the poet. The idea that builds in ones mind is that the poet has the ability to change whether or not the external agent causing him to be acted upon in such a manner continues to do so or ever did so in the first place.

With Boy appearing twenty eight times in the Theognidean corpus, it appears more frequently than Woman, *Eros*, and equally as frequently as *Ekthros*. It is surpassed in frequency by Man and *Philos*. It seems apparent, therefore, that Boy is a greater erotic object than Woman is, with *Eros* occurring frequently in conjunction with Boy. Further, Man and *Philos* are not ideas with which pederastic love can be as easily associated; *Philos*, as in "to love a Boy" (Παιδοφιλεῖν) does occur; nounal *Philos* representing the emotion of Filotic love as opposed to the physical act of intimacy represented by verbal *Philos* does not as frequently occur in conjunction with Boy.

Thus we have examined poems that use the word Eros and its cognates, and see that Eros occupies on the spectrum of love positions in the extremities, positions not only harmful to one's social station but also ones that one is sometimes forcibly driven to engage in. We have seen that the use of Aphrodite in the selected Theognidean poetry indicates that Aphrodite occupies a position that is neither extreme nor external; her effects being felt internally when refused or resisted are not so great that they cannot be overcome or dealt with. I have shown that Aphrodite is a passive element, not a true agent, and Eros is active and an agent. Following this, I have demonstrated that Philos in the Theognidea occupies thematic space that keeps itself from overpowering and overwhelming boundaries, as they exist between humans and are not resultant of the intervention of gods. The penultimate section concerns itself with Hate, where we have seen that hate relationships are not divinely inspired but caused by human interaction; where human transgression caused by human action is grounds for hate, but human transgression caused by divine action is not. Finally, I examined poems that concern the Pais (Boy), where I have demonstrated that the erotic Boy is of great interest to the Theognidean poet in physically erotic contexts.

Appendices

1. Greek and English (translations) Poems
2. Close Reading of Selected poems in the Theognidea
3. Woman in Theognis
4. Man in Theognis

All Translations are by J.M. Edmonds, 1931.

Appendix 1: Greek and English Poems

667-682

εἰ μὲν χρήματ' ἔχοιμι, Σιμωνίδη, οἴαπερ
ἦθη

οὐκ ἂν ἀνιώμην τοῖς ἀγαθοῖσι συνών:
νῦν δέ με γινώσκοντα παρέρχεται, εἰμὶ
δ' ἄφωνος

χρημοσύνη, πολλῶν γνοῦς ἂν ἄμεινον
ἐτέων,

οὐνεκα νῦν φερόμεσθα καθ' ἰστία
λευκὰ βαλόντες

μηλίου ἐκ πόντου νύκτα διὰ
δνοφέρην:

ἀντλεῖν δ' οὐκ ἐθέλουσιν: ὑπερβάλλει
δὲ θάλασσα

ἀμφοτέρων τοίχων: ἦ μάλα τις
χαλεπῶς

σῶζεται οἷ ἔρδουσι: κυβερνήτην μὲν
ἔπαυσαν

ἐσθλόν, ὅτις φυλακὴν εἶχεν
ἐπισταμένως,

χρήματα δ' ἀρπάζουσι βίη: κόσμος δ'
ἀπόλωλεν,

δασμὸς δ' οὐκέτ' ἴσος γίνεται ἐς τὸ
μέσον:

φορτηγοὶ δ' ἄρχουσι, κακοὶ δ' ἀγαθῶν
καθύπερθεν:

δειμαίνω μή πως ναῦν κατὰ κύμα πῆη.

ταυτά μοι ἠνίχθω κεχρησμένα τοῖς
ἀγαθοῖσιν:

γινώσκοι δ' ἂν τις καὶ κακός, ἂν σοφὸς
ᾖ.

667-682

Had I wealth, Simonides, equal to my
character, I should not be so sad as I am
in the company of the good. But alas!
Wealth passeth by one that he knoweth,
and I am speechless for want, albeit I
should have seen better than many of my
fellow-townsmen that now, with our white
sails lowered, we are carried through the
murky night from out the Melian Sea, and
bale they will not, though the sea washeth
over both gunwales; O but great is our
jeopardy that they do what they do! —
they have stayed the hand of a good
steersman who had them in the keeping
of his skill, and they seize the cargo
perforce; order there is none, and fair
division for all is no more; the menial
porters are in command, and the bad
above the good; I fear me lest the ship be
swallowed of the waves. Such be my
riddling oracle for the good, but a bad
man will understand it also, if he have wit.

19-38

Κύρνε, σοφιζομένω μὲν ἐμοὶ σφρηγίς
ἐπκείσθω

τοῖσδ' ἔπεσιν, λήσει δ' οὔποτε κλεπτόμενα,
οὔδέ τις ἀλλάξει κάκιον τοῦσθλοῦ
παρέοντος,

ᾧδε δὲ πᾶς τις ἐρεῖ: 'Θεύγνιδός ἐστιν ἔπη
τοῦ Μεγαρέως πάντας δὲ κατ' ἀνθρώπους
ὀνομαστοῦ,'

ἀστοῖσιν δ' οὔπω πᾶσιν ἀδεῖν δύναμαι:

οὔδεν θαυμαστόν, Πολυπαΐδη: οὔδὲ γὰρ ὁ
Ζεὺς

οὔθ' ὕων πάντεσσ' ἀνδάνει οὔτ' ἀνέχων.

σοὶ δ' ἐγὼ εὖ φρονέων ὑποθήσομαι, οἷά
περ αὐτός,

Κύρν', ἀπὸ τῶν ἀγαθῶν παῖς ἔτ' ἐὼν
ἔμαθον.

πέπνυσο, μηδ' αἰσχροῖσιν ἐπ' ἔργμασι μηδ'
ἀδίκουσιν

30τιμὰς μηδ' ἀρετὰς ἔλκεο μηδ' ἄφενος.

ταῦτα μὲν οὔτως ἴσθι: κακοῖσι δὲ μὴ
προσομίλει

ἀνδράσιν, ἀλλ' αἰεὶ τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἔχεο:

καὶ παρὰ τοῖσιν πῖνε καὶ ἔσθιε, καὶ μετὰ
τοῖσιν

ἵζε καὶ ἄνδανε τοῖς, ὧν μεγάλη δύναμις.

35ἐσθλῶν μὲν γὰρ ἅπ' ἐσθλὰ μαθήσεται: ἦν
δὲ κακοῖσιν

συμμίσγης, ἀπολεῖς καὶ τὸν ἐόντα νόον.

ταῦτα μαθὼν ἀγαθοῖσιν ὀμίλει, καὶ ποτε
φήσεις

εὖ συμβουλεύειν τοῖσι φίλοισιν ἐμέ.

19-38

Let the seal of the wise man, Cyrnus, be set
upon these lines, and they shall never be
filched from him, nor shall evil ever be
changed with their good, but every man shall
say 'These are the lines of Theognis of
Megara, famous throughout the world,' albeit I
have not yet been able to please all my fellow-
towns-men — nor is that to be marvelled at,
thou son of Polypaus, seeing that Zeus
himself pleaseth not every man neither in the
sending of the rain nor in the withholding of it.
But 'tis with good intent to thee, Cyrnus, that I
shall give thee the counsels which I learnt
from good men in my own Boyhood. Be thou
wise and draw to thyself neither honours nor
virtues nor substance on account of
dishonourable or unrighteous deeds. This
then I would have thee to know, nor to consort
with the bad but ever to cleave unto the good,
and at their tables to eat and to drink, and with
them to sit, and them to please, for their
power is great. Of good men shalt thou learn
good, but if thou mingle with the bad, thou
shalt e'en lose the wit thou hast already.
Consort therefore with the good, and
someday thou'lt say that I counsel my friends
aright.

805-810

τόρνου καὶ στάθμης καὶ γνώμονος
ἄνδρα θεωρὸν
εὐθύτερον χρῆ ἔμεν, Κύρνε,
φυλασσόμενον,
ῶτινί κεν Πυθῶνι θεοῦ χρήσασ' ἰέρεια
ὀμφὴν σημήνην πίονος ἐξ ἀδύτου:
οὔτε τι γὰρ προσθεῖς οὐδέν κ' ἔτι
φάρμακον εὐροις,
οὔτ' ἀφελὼν πρὸς θεῶν ἀμπλακίην
προφύγοις.

543-546

χρῆ με παρὰ στάθμην καὶ γνώμονα
τήνδε δικάσσαι,
Κύρνε, δίκην, ἴσόν τ' ἀμφοτέροισι
δόμεν,
... Μάντεσί τ' οἰωνοῖς τε καὶ αἰθομένοις
ἱεροῖσιν,
ἄφρα μὴ ἀμπλακίης αἰσχρὸν ὄνειδος
ἔχω.

805-810

Nearer to the line than compasses,
ruddle, or square, Cyrnus, must that
enquirer be diligent to be, to whom the
priestess of the God declareth her answer
from the rich shrine of Pytho, because
neither by adding aught canst thou find
any remedy, nor in taking-away escape
offence in the eyes of Heaven.

543-546

I must decide this suit by ruddle and
square, Cyrnus, and be fair to both
parties, [on the one side ...] and on the
other prophets and omens and burnt-
offerings, or else I shall bear the foul
reproach of wrong-doing.

1231-1234

Σχέτλι Ἔρωσ, μανίαι σ' ἐτιθηνήσαντο
λαβοῦσαι:
ἐκ σέθεν ὤλετο μὲν Ἰλίου ἀκρόπολις,
ὤλετο δ' Αἰγείδης Θησεύς μέγας,
ὤλετο δ' Αἴας
ἔσθλός Ὀϊλιάδης σῆσιν ἀτασθαλῆς.

1275-1278

ὠραῖος καὶ Ἔρωσ ἐπιτέλλεται, ἠνίκα
περ γῆ
ἄνθεσιν εἰαρινοῖς θάλλει ἀεξομένη:
τῆμος Ἔρωσ προλιπὼν Κύπρον,
περικαλλέα νῆσον,
εἴσιν ἐπ' ἀνθρώπων χάρμα φέρων
κατὰ γῆν.

1231-1234

Cruel Love, Frenzies were they that took
thee up and nursed thee; through thee
came ruin to Ilium's stronghold, came ruin
to great Theseus son of Aegeus, and ruin
to noble Ajax son of Oileus, by reason of
thy presumptuousness.

1275-1278

Love himself riseth in due season, when
the earth swelleth and bloweth with the
flowers of Spring; ay, then cometh Love
from Cyprus' beauteous isle with joy for
man throughout the world.

1329-1334

σοί τε διδόντι τι καλὸν ἐμοί τ' οὐκ
αἰσχρὸν ἐρῶντι

αἰτεῖν. ἀλλὰ γονεὺν λίσσομαι
ἡμετέρων,

αἶδεό μ', ὦ παῖ καλὲ, διδοὺς χάριν, ἢ εἴ
ποτε καὶ σὺ

ἤξεις Κυπρογενοῦς δῶρον ἰοστεφάνου
χρηίζων, καὶ ἐπ' ἄλλον ἐλεύσειαι, ἀλλὰ
σε δαίμων

δοίη τῶν αὐτῶν ἀντιτυχεῖν ἐπέων.

1335-1336

ὄλβιος, ὅστις ἐρῶν γυμνάζεται οἴκαδε
δ' ἐλθῶν

εὔδει σὺν καλῷ παιδί πανημέριος.

1337-1340

οὐκέτ' ἐρῶ παιδός, χαλεπὰς δ'
ἀπελάκτισ' ἀνίας,

μοχθούς τ' ἀργαλέους ἄσμενος
ἐξέφυγον,

ἐκκέλυμαι δὲ πόθου πρὸς ἐϋστεφάνου
Κυθερείης:

σοὶ δ', ὦ παῖ, χάρις ἔστ' οὐδεμία πρὸς
ἐμοῦ.

1341-1344

αἰαί, παιδὸς ἐρῶ ἀπαλόχροος, ὅς με
φίλοισιν

πᾶσι μάλ' ἐκφαίνει κοῦκ ἐθέλοντος
ἐμοῦ.

τλήσομαι οὐ κρύψας ἀεκούσια πολλὰ
βίαια:

οὐ γὰρ ἐπ' αἰκελίῳ παιδί δαμείς
ἐφάνην.

1329-1334

To thee that grantest it my suit bringeth
honour, and to me that desire it no
disgrace; I beseech thee, by my parents,
fair lad, have respect unto me and grant
me favour; or if ever thou in thy turn shalt
come to another to crave the gift of the
violet-crownad Cyprus-born, God grant
thou meet with the same words that I
meet with now.

1335-1336

Happy he that loveth as he taketh his
practice and when he goeth home
sleepeth the day out with a fair lad.

1337-1340

I no longer love a lad; I have shaken off
sore troubles and gladly 'scaped grievous
distress; I am delivered of my longing by
the wreathed Cytherea, and thou, lad,
hast no favour in my eyes.

1341-1344

Woe 's me! I love a smooth-skinned lad
who exposeth me to all my friends, nor
am I loath; I will bear with many things
that are sore against my liking, and make
it no secret; for 'tis no unhandsome lad I
am seen to be taken with.

1345-1350

Παιδοφιλεῖν δέ τι τερπνόν, ἐπεὶ ποτε
καὶ Γανυμήδους
ἠράσατο Κρονίδης ἀθανάτων
βασιλεύς,
ἀρπάξας δ' ἐς Ὀλυμπον ἀνήγαγε, καί
μιν ἔθηκε
δαίμονα παιδείης ἄνθος ἔχοντ'
ἐρατόν.
οὕτω μὴ θαύμαζε, Σιμωνίδη, οὐνεκα
κάγῳ

ἐξεφάνην καλοῦ παιδὸς ἔρωτι δαμείς.

1345-1350

A pleasant thing hath lad's-love ever been
since Ganymede was loved of the great
Son of Cronus, the king of the Immortals,
who seized and brought him to Olympus
and made him a God, what time his
boyhood was in its lovely flower. In like
manner, Simonides, be not thou
astonished that 'tis come out that I too am
taken with the love of a fair lad.

1275-1278

ὠραῖος καὶ Ἔρωσ ἐπιτέλλεται, ἠνίκα
περ γῆ
ἄνθεσιν εἰαρινοῖς θάλλει ἀεξομένη:
τῆμος Ἔρωσ προλιπὼν Κύπρον,
περικαλλέα νῆσον,
εἶσιν ἐπὶ ἀνθρώπους χάρμα φέρων
κατὰ γῆν.

1275-1278

Love himself riseth in due season, when
the earth swelleth and bloweth with the
flowers of Spring; ay, then cometh Love
from Cyprus' beauteous isle with joy for
man throughout the world.

1329-1334

σοί τε διδόντι τι καλὸν ἐμοί τ' οὐκ
αἰσχρὸν ἐρῶντι
αἰτεῖν. ἀλλὰ γονεῶν λίσσομαι
ἡμετέρων,
αἶδεό μ', ὦ παῖ καλὲ, διδοῦς χάριν, ἢ εἴ
ποτε καὶ σὺ
ἦξεις Κυπρογενοῦς δῶρον ἰοστεφάνου
χρηζών, καὶ ἐπ' ἄλλον ἐλεύσειαι, ἀλλὰ
σε δαίμων
δοίη τῶν αὐτῶν ἀντιτυχεῖν ἐπέων.

1329-1334

To thee that grantest it my suit bringeth
honour, and to me that desire it no
disgrace; I beseech thee, by my parents,
fair lad, have respect unto me and grant
me favour; or if ever thou in thy turn shalt
come to another to crave the gift of the
violet-crown'd Cyprus-born, God grant
thou meet with the same words that I
meet with now.

1337-1340

οὐκέτ' ἐρῶ παιδός, χαλεπὰς δ'

ἀπελάκτισ' ἀνίας,
μοχθούς τ' ἀργαλέους ἄσμενος
ἐξέφυγον,
ἐκλέλυμαι δὲ πόθου πρὸς εὐστεφάνου
Κυθερείης:
σοὶ δ', ὦ παῖ, χάρις ἔστ' οὐδεμία πρὸς
ἐμοῦ.

1283-1294

ὦ παῖ, μή μ' ἀδίκει -- ἔτι σοι καταθύμιος
εἶναι
βούλομ' -- ἐπιφροσύνη τοῦτο συνεῖς
ἀγαθῆ:
οὐ γὰρ τοί με δόλω παρελεύσεαι οὐδ'
ἀπατήσεις:
νικήσας γὰρ ἔχεις τὸ πλεόν ἐξοπίσω,
ἀλλὰ σ' ἐγὼ τρώσω φεύγοντά με, ὥς
ποτέ φασιν
Ἰασίου κούρην ἦθεον Ἴππομένην,
ὠραίην περ ἐοῦσαν, ἀναινομένην
γάμον ἀνδρῶν
φεύγειν: ζωσαμένη δ' ἔργ' ἀτέλεστα
τέλει,
πατρὸς νοσφισθεῖσα δόμων, ξανθὴ
Ἀταλάντη:
ᾤχετο δ' ὑψηλὰς ἐς κορυφὰς ὀρέων,
φεύγουσ' ἱμερόεντα γάμον χρυσοῆς
Ἀφροδίτης
δῶρα: τέλος δ' ἔγνω καὶ μάλ'
ἀναινομένη.

1299-1304

ὦ παῖ, μέχρι τίνος με προφεύξεται; ὥς
σε διώκων
δίζημ'. ἀλλὰ τί μοι τέρμα γένοιτο κιχεῖν
σῆς ὀργῆς. σὺ δὲ μάργον ἔχων καὶ
ἀγήνορα θυμὸν
φεύγεις, ἰκτίνου σχέτλιον ἦθος ἔχων.
ἀλλ' ἐπίμεινον, ἐμοὶ δὲ δίδου χάριν.
οὐκέτι δηρὸν
ἔξεις Κυπρογενοῦς δῶρον
ἰοστεφάνου.

1305-1310

1337-1340

I no longer love a lad; I have shaken off
sore troubles and gladly 'scaped grievous
distress; I am delivered of my longing by
the wreathed Cytherea, and thou, lad,
hast no favour in my eyes.

1283-1294

Wrong me not, lad (still would I fain be
to thy liking, but understand this with good
shrewdness; [thy wiles] shall not
circumvent me nor deceive me; thou hast
won, and thine is the advantage hereafter,
but yet will I wound thee as thou fliest me,
even as they tell that the daughter of
Iasius once fled [the young Hippomenes],
refusing wedlock for all she was ripe to
wed; ay, girded herself up and
accomplished the unaccomplishable,
forsaking her father's house, the fair-
haired Atalanta, and was away to the high
tops of the hills, flying from delightful
wedlock, gift of golden Aphrodite; yet for
all her refusing, she came to know the
end.

1299-1304

How long wilt thou fly me, lad? O how
hotfoot do I pursue thee! Heaven grant
some end may come to thy anger. Yet
thou fliest me in the greed and
haughtiness of thy heart, and thy ways
are the cruel ways of a kite. O stay and
grant me thy favour; not for long now wilt
thou possess the gift of the violet-
crownad Cyprus-born.

1305θυμῶ γνοὺς ὅτι παιδείας
πολυηράτου ἄνθος

ώκύτερον σταδίου, τοῦτο συνεῖς
χάλασον
δεσμοῦ, μήποτε καὶ σὺ βιήσῃαι, ὄβριμε
παίδων,
Κυπρογενοῦς δ' ἔργων ἀντιάσεις
χαλεπῶν,
ὡσπερ ἐγὼ νῦν ὦδ' ἐπὶ σοί. σὺ δὲ
ταῦτα φύλαξαι,
μηδέ σε νικήσῃ παιδ' ἀδαῆ κακότης.

1323-1326

Κυπρογένῃ, παῦσόν με πόνων,
σκέδασον δὲ μερίμνας
θυμοβόρους, στρέψον δ' αὔθις ἐς
εὐφροσύνας,
μερμήρας δ' ἀπόπαυε κακάς, δὸς δ'
εὐφροῦνι θυμῷ

1329-1334

σοί τε διδόντι τι καλὸν ἐμοί τ' οὐκ
αἰσχρὸν ἐρώντι
αἰτεῖν. ἀλλὰ γονεὺν λίσσομαι
ἡμετέρων,
αἶδεό μ', ὦ παῖ καλὲ, διδοὺς χάριν, ἢ εἴ
ποτε καὶ σὺ
ἦξῃς Κυπρογενοῦς δῶρον ἰοστεφάνου
χρηίζων, καὶ ἐπ' ἄλλον ἐλεύσῃαι, ἀλλὰ
σε δαίμων
δοίῃ τῶν αὐτῶν ἀντιτυχεῖν ἐπέων.

1381-1382

ἄνθρωφ', οἷ σ' ἐδόκουν χρυσῆς παρὰ
δῶρον ἔχοντα
ἐλθεῖν Κυπρογενοῦς ...

1383-1385

... δῶρον ἰοστεφάνου
γίνεται ἀνθρώποισιν ἔχειν
χαλεπώτατον ἄχθος,
ἂν μὴ Κυπρογενῆς δῶ λύσιν ἐκ
χαλεπῶν.

1305-1310

Knowing in thy heart that the flowering-
time of sweet delightful Boyhood is fleeter
than a footrace, free me from my bonds,
lest ever thou be thyself put under
restraint, thou mighty among lads, and be
confronted with the harsh works of the
Cyprus-born even as I am, here and now,
for thee. Beware then thou, lest badness
overwhelm thy Boyish ignorance.

μέτρ' ἤβης τελέσαντ' ἔργματα
σωφροσύνης.

1323-1326

O Cyprus-born, end Thou my woes,
scatter my carking cares, turn me again
unto good cheer, make cease my evil
imaginings, and grant me to accomplish
the works of wisdom when I have fulfilled
merrily the measure of Youth.

1329-1334

To thee that grantest it my suit bringeth
honour, and to me that desire it no
disgrace; I beseech thee, by my parents,
fair lad, have respect unto me and grant
me favour; or if ever thou in thy turn shalt
come to another to crave the gift of the
violet-crownad Cyprus-born, God grant
thou meet with the same words that I
meet with now.

1381-1382

Those that expected thee, man, to come
to bestow the gift of the golden Cyprus-
born ...

1383-1385

the gift of the violet-crownad ... becometh
a most grievous burden unto man, unless
the Cyprus-born grant deliverance from
trouble.

1386-1389

Κυπρογενὲς Κυθήρεια δολοπλόκε, σοί
τι περισσὸν
Ζεὺς τόδε τιμήσας δῶρον ἔδωκεν
ἔχειν:
δαμνᾶς ἀνθρώπων πυκινὰς φρένας,
οὐδέ τις ἐστὶν
οὕτως ἴφθιμος καὶ σοφὸς ὥστε φυγεῖν.

1386-1388

Cyprus-born Cytherea, weaver of wiles,
Zeus hath given Thee this gift because
He honoureth Thee exceeding much —
Thou overweldest the shrewd wits of
men, nor lives the man so strong and
wise that he may escape Thee.

1275-1278

ῥαίος καὶ Ἔρως ἐπιτέλλεται, ἠνίκα
περ γῆ
ἄνθεσιν εἰαρινοῖς θάλλει ἀεξομένη:

τῆμος Ἔρως προλιπὼν Κύπρον,
περικαλλέα νῆσον,
εἴσιν ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους χάρμα φέρων
κατὰ γῆν.

1275-1278

Love himself riseth in due season, when
the earth swelleth and bloweth with the
flowers of Spring; ay, then cometh Love
from Cyprus' beauteous isle with joy for
man throughout the world.

1329-1334

σοί τε διδόντι τι καλὸν ἐμοί τ' οὐκ
αἰσχρὸν ἐρῶντι
αἰτεῖν. ἀλλὰ γονεὼν λίσσομαι
ἡμετέρων,
αἶδεό μ', ὦ παῖ καλὲ, διδοῦς χάριν, ἢ εἴ
ποτε καὶ σὺ
ἦξεις Κυπρογενοῦς δῶρον ἰοστεφάνου
χρηίζων, καὶ ἐπ' ἄλλον ἐλεύσειαι, ἀλλὰ
σε δαίμων
δοίη τῶν αὐτῶν ἀντιτυχεῖν ἐπέων.

1329-1334

To thee that grantest it my suit bringeth
honour, and to me that desire it no
disgrace; I beseech thee, by my parents,
fair lad, have respect unto me and grant
me favour; or if ever thou in thy turn shalt
come to another to crave the gift of the
violet-crownad Cyprus-born, God grant
thou meet with the same words that I
meet with now.

1337-1340

οὐκέτ' ἐρῶ παιδός, χαλεπὰς δ' ἀπελάκτισ'
άνιας,
μοχθούς τ' ἀργαλέους ἄσμενος ἐξέφυγον,
ἐκλέλυμαι δὲ πόθου πρὸς εὔστεφάνου
Κυθερείης:

σοὶ δ', ὦ παῖ, χάρις ἔστ' οὐδεμία πρὸς
ἐμοῦ.

1337-1340

I no longer love a lad; I have shaken off sore
troubles and gladly 'scaped grievous distress;

I am delivered of my longing by the wreathed
Cytherea, and thou, lad, hast no favour in my

eyes.

87-92

μή μ' ἔπεσιν μὲν στέργε νόον δ' ἔχε
καὶ φρένας ἄλλη,
εἴ με φιλεῖς καὶ σοὶ πιστὸς ἔνεστι νόος,
ἀλλὰ φίλει καθαρὸν θέμενος νόον, ἢ μ'
ἀποειπῶν
90ἔχθαιρ' ἀμφαδίην νεῖκος
ἀειρώμενος.
ὃς δὲ μὴ γλώσση δίχ' ἔχει νόον, οὗτος
ἑταῖρος
δεινός, Κύρν', ἐχθρὸς βέλτερος ἢ
φίλος ὢν.

87-92

If thou lovest me and the heart within thee
is loyal, be not my friend but in word, with
heart and mind turned contrary; either
love me with a whole heart, or disown me
and hate me in open quarrel. Whosoever
is in two minds with one tongue, he,
Cyrnus, is a dangerous comrade, better
as foe than friend.

93-100

ἦν τις ἐπαινῆση σε τόσον χρόνον
ὅσον ὀρώη
νοσφισθεῖς δ' ἄλλη γλώσσαν ἰῆσι
κακὴν,
τοιοῦτός τοι ἑταῖρος ἀνὴρ φίλος οὔτι
μάλ' ἐσθλός,
ὃς κ' εἶπη λῶα φρονῆ δ' ἕτερα.
ἀλλ' εἴη τοιοῦτος ἐμοὶ φίλος, ὃς τὸν
ἑταῖρον
γινώσκων ὀργὴν καὶ βαρὺν ὄντα φέρει
ἀντὶ κασιγνήτου. σὺ δὲ μοι, φίλε, ταῦτ'
ἐνὶ θυμῷ
φράζεο, καὶ ποτέ μου μνήσεται
ἐξοπίσω.

93-100

If one praise thee so long as he see thee,
and speak ill of thee behind thy back,
such a comrade, for sure, is no very good
friend — the man, to wit, whose tongue
speaks fair and his mind thinks ill. But I
would be friends with him that seeketh to
know his comrade's temper and beareth
with him like a brother. And thou, friend,
consider this well, and someday hereafter
thou'lt remember me.

337-340

Ζεὺς μοι τῶν τε φίλων δοίη τίσιν οἷ με
φιλεῦσιν,
τῶν τ' ἐχθρῶν μείζον, Κύρνε,
δυνησαμένων:
χοῦτως ἂν δοκέοιμι μετ' ἀνθρώπων
θεὸς εἶναι,
εἴ μ' ἀποτεισάμενον μοῖρα κίχου
θανάτου.

337-340

Zeus grant me to repay the friends that
love me, and mine enemies that have
proved stronger than I; then shall I seem
a God among men, if the destiny of death
overtake me with all paid.

351-354

Ἄ δειλή Πενίη, τί μένεις προλιπούς α
παρ' ἄλλον
ἄνδρ' ἰέναι; μὴ δὴ μ' οὐκ ἐθέλοντα
φίλει,
ἀλλ' ἴθι καὶ δόμον ἄλλον ἐποίχεο, μηδὲ
μεθ' ἡμέων
αἰεὶ δυστήνου τοῦδε βίου μέτεχε.

351-354

O thou miserable Penury, why delayest
thou to leave me for some other man? I
prithce love me not against my will, but
away and begone to another house, and
share not evermore this wretched life with
me.

783-788

ῥῆλθον μὲν γὰρ ἔγωγε καὶ εἰς Σικελίην
ποτε γαίαν,
ῆλθον δ' Εὐβοίης ἀμπελόεν πεδίον,
σπάρτην τ' Εὐρώτα δονακοτρόφου
ἀγλαὸν ἄστν,
καὶ μ' ἐφίλειεν προφρόνως πάντες
ἐπερχόμενον.
ἀλλ' οὔτις μοι τέρψις ἐπὶ φρένας
ῆλθεν ἐκείνων:
οὔτως οὐδὲν ἄρ' ἦν φίλτερον ἄλλο
πάτρης.

783-788

For I have been ere now to the land of
Sicily, ere now to the vine-clad lowlands
of Euboea, and to Sparta the glorious
town of reedy Eurotas, and all made me
welcome in right friendly wise; but not one
of them came as a joy to my heart, so
true is it after all that there's no place like
home.

869-872

ἔν μοι ἔπειτα πέσοι μέγας οὐρανὸς
εὐρύς ὑπερθεν
χάλκεος, ἀνθρώπων δεῖμα
χαμαιγενέων,
εἰ μὴ ἐγὼ τοῖσιν μὲν ἐπαρκέσω οἷ με
φιλεῦσι,
τοῖς δ' ἐχθοῖς ἀνίη καὶ μέγα πῆμ'
ἔσομαι.

869-872

May the great wide brazen sky fall upon
me —that dread of earthborn men —if I
aid not such as love me, and become not
a pain and great grief unto such as hate.

873-876

Οἶνε, τὰ μὲν σ' αἰνῶ, τὰ δὲ μέμφομαι:
οὐδέ σε πάμπαν

οὔτε ποτ' ἐχθαίρειν οὔτε φιλεῖν
δύναμαι.
ἔσθλὸν καὶ κακὸν ἔσσι: τίς ἂν σέ γε
μωμήσαιτο,
τίς δ' ἂν ἐπαινῆσαι, μέτρον ἔχων
σοφίης;

873-876
O Wine, in part I praise thee, and in part
blame; never can I either hate thee or
love thee altogether. Thou art both a good
thing and a bad. Who would blame thee
and who praise, that had due measure of
wisdom?

1082ξ-1082φ
μή μ' ἔπεσιν μὲν στέργε, νόον δ' ἔχε
καὶ φρένας ἄλλη,
εἴ με φιλεῖς καὶ σοι πιστὸς ἔνεστι νόος;
ἀλλὰ φίλει καθαρὸν θέμενος νόον ἢ μ'
ἀποειπῶν
ἔχθαιρ', ἐμφανέως νεῖκος ἀειρώμενος.

1082C-1082F
If thou love me and the heart within the be
true, be not my friend but in word, with
heart and mind contrary; either love me
with a whole heart or disown me and hate
me in open quarrel.

οὔτε γὰρ ἐχθαίρειν οὔτε φιλεῖν
δύναμαι,
γινώσκων χαλεπὸν μὲν, ὅταν φίλος
ἀνδρὶ γένηται,
ἐχθαίρειν, χαλεπὸν δ' οὐκ ἐθέλοντα
φιλεῖν.

1091-1094
Ἀργαλέως μοι θυμὸς ἔχει περὶ σῆς
φιλότητος:

1091-1094
My heart is troubled for thy friendship; I
can neither hate nor love, knowing that 'tis
as hard to hate one that is become our
friend as to be friends with one that wills it
not.

1164α-1164δ
τοιούτος τοι ἀνὴρ ἔστω φίλος, ὃς τὸν
ἑταῖρον
γινώσκων ὀργὴν καὶ βαρὺν ὄντα φέρει
ἀντὶ κασιγνήτου. σὺ δέ μοι, φίλε, τοῦτ'
ἐνὶ θυμῷ
φράζεο, καὶ ποτέ μου μνήσεται
ἐξοπίσω.

1164A-1164D
Let such be thy friend as seeketh to know
his comrade's temper and beareth with
him like a brother. And thou, friend,
consider this well, and some day
hereafter thou 'lt remember me.

1255-1256

ὅστις μὴ παῖδάς τε φιλεῖ καὶ μώνυχας
ἵππους

καὶ κύνας, οὐπότέ οἱ θυμὸς ἐν
εὐφροσύνῃ:

1255-1256

1267-1270

παῖς τε καὶ ἵππος ὁμοῖον ἔχει νόον:
οὔτε γὰρ ἵππος
ἠνίοχον κλαίει κείμενον ἐν κονίῃ,
ἀλλὰ τὸν ὕστερον ἄνδρα φέρει
κριθαῖσι κορεσθεῖς:
ὡς δ' αὐτως καὶ παῖς τὸν παρεόντα
φιλεῖ.

He that loveth not Boyren and whole-
hoovad steeds and hounds, never is his
heart merry.

1267-1270

Like are the minds of a lad and of a
horse; the horse weepeth not because his
rider is in the dust, but hath his fill of
barley and carrieth another in his turn;
and in like manner a lad loveth him that is
present to him.

1311-1318

οὐ μ' ἔλαθες κλέψας, ὦ παῖ: καὶ γὰρ σε
διώμμαι.
τούτοις οἷσπερ νῦν ἄρθμιος ἡδὲ φίλος
ἔπλευ, ἐμὴν δὲ μεθήκας ἀτίμητον
φιλότητα --
οὐ μὲν δὴ τούτοις γ' ἦσθα φίλος
πρότερον,
ἀλλ' ἐγὼ ἐκ πάντων σ' ἐδόκουν
θήσεσθαι ἐταῖρον
πιστόν: καὶ δὴ νῦν ἄλλον ἔχεισθα
φίλον.
ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν εὖ ἔρδων κείμαι: σὲ δὲ
μήτις ἀπάντων
ἀνθρώπων ἐσορῶν παιδοφιλεῖν ἐθέλοι.

1311-1318

I know well enough thou didst cheat me,
lad; for I can e'en see through thee.
Those with whom thou art now so close
and friendly, abandoning for worthless thy
friendship for me, with them thou wast not
friends before; whereas I, I thought to
make thee of all my comrades the truest,
and now thou hast another to thy friend. I
that did well by thee lie neglected; I would
that no man living who shall see thee may
be willing to set his love on thee.

1345-1350

Παιδοφιλεῖν δέ τι τερπνόν, ἐπεὶ ποτε
καὶ Γανυμήδους
ἠράσατο Κρονίδης ἀθανάτων
βασιλεύς,
ἀρπάξας δ' ἐς Ὀλυμπον ἀνήγαγε, καὶ
μιν ἔθηκε
δαίμονα παιδείης ἄνθος ἔχοντ'
ἐρατόν.
οὕτω μὴ θαύμαζε, Σιμωνίδη, οὐνεκα
κάγῳ
ἐξεφάνην καλοῦ παιδὸς ἔρωτι δαμείς.

1345-1350

A pleasant thing hath lad's-love ever been
since Ganymede was loved of the great
Son of Cronus, the king of the Immortals,
who seized and brought him to Olympus
and made him a God, what time his
boyhood was in its lovely flower. In like
manner, Simonides, be not thou
astonished that 'tis come out that I too am
taken with the love of a fair lad.

1367-1368

παιδός τοι χάρις ἐστί, γυναικὶ δὲ πίστις
ἐταίρη
οὐδεμί', ἀλλ' αἰεὶ τὸν παρόντα φιλεῖ.

1367-1368

Gratitude belongeth, 'tis sure, to a lad; but
a woman-comrade is never true; she
loveth him that is present unto her.

579-584

α: ἐχθαίρω κακὸν ἄνδρα, καλυψαμένη
δὲ πάρειμι

σικρῆς ὄρνιθος κοῦφον ἔχουσα νόον.

β: ἐχθαίρω δὲ γυναῖκα περίδρομον,
ἄνδρα τε μάργον

ᾠς τὴν ἀλλοτρίην βούλετ' ἄρουραν
ἀροῦν.

α: καὶ Β: ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν προβέβηκεν,
ἀμήχανόν ἐστι γενέσθαι

ἀργά: τὰ δ' ἐξοπίσω, τῶν φυλακῆ
μελέτω.

579-584

She. I hate a bad man and veil my face
as I pass him, keeping my heart light as a
little bird's. He. And I hate both a
gadabout woman and a lustful man that
chooseth to plough another's land. Both.
But what's done cannot be undone: 'tis
the future that needs watch and ward.

1091-1094

Ἀργαλέως μοι θυμὸς ἔχει περὶ σῆς
φιλότητος:

οὔτε γὰρ ἐχθαίρειν οὔτε φιλεῖν
δύναμαι,

γινώσκων χαλεπὸν μὲν, ὅταν φίλος
ἀνδρὶ γένηται,

ἐχθαίρειν, χαλεπὸν δ' οὐκ ἐθέλοντα
φιλεῖν.

1091-1094

My heart is troubled for thy friendship; I
can neither hate nor love, knowing that 'tis
as hard to hate one that is become our
friend as to be friends with one that wills it
not.

1079-1080

οὐδένα τῶν ἐχθρῶν μωμήσομαι
ἐσθλὸν ἐόντῃ,
οὐδὲ μὲν αἰνήσω δειλὸν ἐόντα φίλον.

1079-1080

I will blame no enemy that is a good man,
nor yet praise a friend that is bad.

1219-1220

ἐχθρῷ μὲν χαλεπὸν τὸν δυσμενῆ
ἐξαπατήσαι
Κύρνε, φίλον δὲ φίλῳ ῥάδιον
ἐξαπατᾶν.

1219-1220

'Tis hard in sooth for an enemy to deceive
his foe, Cynus, but easy for a friend to
deceive his friend.

1318α-1318β

ὦ μοι ἐγὼ δειλός: καὶ δὴ κατάχαρμα
μὲν ἐχθροῖς
τοῖς δὲ φίλοισι πόνος δεινὰ παθῶν
γενόμεν.

1318A-1318B

O miserable me! become I am a joy unto
mine enemies and a vexation to my
friends because of my sufferings.

1267-1270

παῖς τε καὶ ἵππος ὁμοῖον ἔχει νόον:
οὔτε γὰρ ἵππος
ἠνίοχον κλαίει κείμενον ἐν κονίῃ,
ἀλλὰ τὸν ὕστερον ἄνδρα φέρει
κριθαῖσι κορεσθεῖς:
ὥς δ' αὐτῶς καὶ παῖς τὸν παρεόντα
φιλεῖ.

1267-1270

Like are the minds of a lad and of a
horse; the horse weepeth not because his
rider is in the dust, but hath his fill of
barley and carrieth another in his turn;
and in like manner a lad loveth him that is
present to him.

1329-1334

σοὶ τε διδόντι τι καλὸν ἐμοί τ' οὐκ
αἰσχρὸν ἐρῶντι
αἰτεῖν. ἀλλὰ γονεῶν λίσσομαι
ἡμετέρων,
αἶδεό μ', ὦ παῖ καλὲ, διδοῦς χάριν, ἢ εἴ
ποτε καὶ σὺ
ἤξεις Κυπρογενοῦς δῶρον ἰοστεφάνου
χρηίζων, καὶ ἐπ' ἄλλον ἐλεύσει, ἀλλὰ
σε δαίμων
δοίῃ τῶν αὐτῶν ἀντιτυχεῖν ἐπέων.

1329-1334

To thee that grantest it my suit bringeth
honour, and to me that desire it no
disgrace; I beseech thee, by my parents,
fair lad, have respect unto me and grant
me favour; or if ever thou in thy turn shalt
come to another to crave the gift of the
violet-crownad Cyprus-born, God grant
thou meet with the same words that I
meet with now.

1335-1336

ὄλβιος, ὅστις ἐρῶν γυμνάζεται οἴκαδε
δ' ἐλθὼν
εὐθεῖ σὺν καλῷ παιδί πανημέριος.

1335-1336

Happy he that loveth as he taketh his
practice³²⁷ and when he goeth home
sleepeth the day out with a fair lad.

1337-1340

οὐκέτ' ἐρῶ παιδός, χαλεπὰς δ'
ἀπελάκτισ' ἀνίας,
μοχθούς τ' ἀργαλέους ἄσμενος
ἐξέφυγον,
ἐκκλέυμαι δὲ πόθου πρὸς ἐϋστεφάνου
Κυθερείης:
σοὶ δ', ὦ παῖ, χάρις ἔστ' οὐδεμία πρὸς
ἐμοῦ.

I no longer love a lad; I have shaken off
sore troubles and gladly 'scaped grievous
distress; I am delivered of my longing by
the wreathad Cytherea, and thou, lad,
hast no favour in my eyes.

1337-1340

1341-1344

αἰαῖ, παιδὸς ἐρῶ ἀπαλόχροος, ὅς με
φίλοισιν
πᾶσι μάλ' ἐκφαίνει κούκ ἐθέλοντος
ἐμοῦ.

τλήσομαι οὐ κρύψας ἀεκούσια πολλὰ
βίαια:
οὐ γὰρ ἐπ' αἰκελίῳ παιδὶ δαμείς
ἐφάνην.

1341-1344

1345-1350

Παιδοφιλεῖν δέ τι τερπνόν, ἐπεὶ ποτε
καὶ Γανυμήδους
ἠράσατο Κρονίδης ἀθανάτων
βασιλεύς,
ἀρπάξας δ' ἐς Ὀλυμπον ἀνήγαγε, καί
μιν ἔθηκε
δαίμονα παιδείης ἄνθος ἔχοντ'
ἐρατόν.
οὕτω μὴ θαύμαζε, Σιμωνίδη, οὐνεκα
κάγῳ

1367-1368

παιδός τοι χάρις ἐστί, γυναικὶ δὲ πίστις
ἐταίρη
οὐδεμί', ἀλλ' αἰεὶ τὸν παρέοντα φιλεῖ.

Woe 's me! I love a smooth-skinned lad
who exposeth me to all my friends, nor
am I loath; I will bear with many things
that are sore against my liking, and make
it no secret; for 'tis no unhandsome lad I
am seen to be taken with.

ἐξεφάνην καλοῦ παιδὸς ἔρωτι δαμείς.

1345-1350

A pleasant thing hath lad's-love ever been
since Ganymede was loved of the great
Son of Cronus, the king of the Immortals,
who seized and brought him to Olympus
and made him a God, what time his
boyhood was in its lovely flower. In like
manner, Simonides, be not thou
astonished that 'tis come out that I too am
taken with the love of a fair lad.

1367-1368

Gratitude belongeth, 'tis sure, to a lad; but
a woman-comrade is never true; she
loveth him that is present unto her.

Appendix 2 : Close Reading of Selected Poems in the Theognidea

The sympotic poems of the Theognidea at times deal with both friendship and love. This is natural, seeing as the convivial setting is one where the idea

and practice of relationships is important. The following is an examination of how the Theognidea treats the ideas of friendship and love. I will be examining specifically the poems 371-372, 579-582, and 959-962.

The Theognidean poem 371-372 deals with friendship in context of pederasty as well as among social equals. It relates themes of dominance in relationships, between pursuer and pursued in terms of friendship and the metaphor of a plow. I will also consider this poem's treatment of violence in relationship to eroticism.

I will be analyzing as well the Theognidean poem 579-582. This poem deals with themes of socially acceptable erotic relationships for both men and for women. This is achieved with the grammatical gender of specific words within the poem. It too deals with problematic relationships. The first couplet deals less with the erotic than the formation of a socially acceptable erotic relationship. The second couplet deals with themes of active adultery and the acceptability of such behavior in society. Lines 581-582 too are more explicitly erotic than the first. The fact that the couplets contain gendered voices helps to explain these differences.

Lines 959-962 use pastoral and wilderness themes to relate the travails of a troubled relationship. The primary image is that of a spring, and the dirtying of the spring is a metaphor for adultery. (This too could be a metaphor for the meddling of a political opponent, which is explicated but not here explored.) The spring's identity is determined by its context, which is comparable to lines 1249-1252. My analysis of 959-962 also recalls the earlier poems that explore human friendship.

Douglas Gerber's Loeb translation of the Theognidea suggests that this poem is potentially intended to be understood in an erotic sense.

371-372	Do not drive me under the wain, Cynrus,
μή μ' ἀέκοντα λίην κεντῶν ὑπ' ἄμαξαν	goadng me unwilling,
ἔλαυνε	Drawing me for yourself too far into a
εἰς φιλότητα βίη, Κύρνε, προσελκόμενος.	friendship by force.

What is the basis for this assessment? In order to find out, I will be examining the text to understand the societal context of the language being used before putting the poem back into its sympotic context to further seek to understand how it may be interpreted as a poem with an erotic sense.

A likely place from which to begin would be with the prepositional phrase “εἰς φιλότητα.” Φίλος relationships had layers of complexity and interpretation. Much like ξένος relationships (Homer, Iliad, Book 6: 212-236), φίλος relationships had layers of complexity and interpretation. Guest-friend relationships were generally among the aristocrats, as they would have had the means to foster such relationships across substantial geographic barriers. Φίλος relationships are complex, because they could take place between different strata of society, and because they are more general. “Φίλος,” means, “beloved,” or, “dear.” (LSJ). In a symposium, it is likely that one would have several φίλος relationships. Among these, one may ask advice for the purpose of fostering political unity or cohesiveness. But outside of relationships based on social equality, there can be introduced other forms of exchange, and it would not be unlikely for a Cynrus figure (ἐρόμενος) being courted to receive presents from his ἐράστης (lover), much the same way one courts another in political and

marriage contracts. So a φίλος relationship with one's lover would be such that one could be by force driven farther into a φίλος relationship than one desired. This would be accomplished by withholding sexual favors or through blackmail. These are sexual and social impulses respectively. One could be forced to give more than they received in exchange, which would not be the foundation of a good φίλος relationship. Being drawn too far "εἰς φιλότητα" would no longer be an erotic relationship or a positive exchange for the ἐράστης, and could harm him socially. I will further explain the concept of βίη (violence) later.

Agricultural themes are strongly prevalent in much of the ancient world, due to the fact that they lived so close to the land by which they were sustained. Similarly, given plants reproduce sexually and the process for planting and harvesting have clear fertility overtones, it is not uncommon for many agricultural images to also have erotic flavors. "ὑπ' ἄμαξαν," is a good example; under the ἄμαξα. An ἄμαξα is a wagon as directly opposed to the idea of a war chariot. Much the same way as swords and plowshares are seen as direct opposites, so too does this sort of wagon have agricultural overtones, to the point that the sense of the term is the carriage for the plow (Hes.Op.426,453). Thus, if Cygnus is driving the Theognidean poet under the plow, the Theognidean poet becomes the earth being tilled, transforming the ἐράστης into the role of the ἐρόμενος who would normally be described in these agricultural terms as the earth being plowed.

Thus, it may be suggested that the Theognidean poet is being bodily affected by his erstwhile ἐρόμενος, so that it would not be impossible to assume

that the βίη (bodily strength, violence, force) is literal. Given that stereotypical ἐράστης-ἐρόμενος relationships were between an older, adult man and a younger, adolescent boy, physical force would not generally be an option open to an ἐρόμενος trying to force his ἐράστης to be penetrated. I would posit that if an adolescent were to try to forcibly impel an adult to do something against his will, that adolescent would need some form of leverage to weaken the adult. Wine was probably the most prevalent inebriant available. Wine's effects equate to weakening an individual so that they can be affected by another agent more easily, especially an agent who operates through force. Despite this poem's emphasis on the erotic, it is important to understand the paradigmatic simpatico environment within which Theognidean poetry was performed, and the effect of that on the poetry and on the audience. This is why a short discussion of wine is added here.

Understanding that metaphors concerning the sea are oftentimes concerning wine, and understanding that τοῖχος (wall) is often a metaphor for the gunwales of a ship, allows us to delve a little further. Similarly, Lucian²⁵ and Pherecrates²⁶ use τοῖχος to relate to the consumption of wine, thus showing that the drinking metaphor is common.

(673-678)
 ἀντλεῖν δ' οὐκ ἐθέλουσιν: ὑπερβάλλει δὲ
 θάλασσα
 ἀμφοτέρων τοίχων: ἦ μάλα τις χαλεπῶς

σώζεται οἱ ἔρδουσι: κυβερνήτην μὲν
 ἔπαυσαν
 ἐσθλόν, ὅτις φυλακὴν εἶχεν ἐπισταμένως,
 χρήματα δ' ἀρπάζουσι βίη
 (673-678)

²⁵ Luc. Asin.9; of a cup

²⁶ Pherecr.143.2; of a vessel

and bale they will not, though the sea washeth
over both gunwales;
O but great is our jeopardy that they do what
they do!

They have stayed the hand of a good
steersman who had them in the
keeping of his skill, and they seize the cargo
violently²⁷

Despite the fact that 673-678 is an excerpt from 667-682, which broadly concerns the ship of state, it may concern more than this. Symposia too are likened to the πόλις. It seems reasonable to assume that if a symposium may be likened to the πόλις and the metaphor is of the ship of state, that when trouble arises in the ship of state, trouble too may be arising in the symposium. The final word in this excerpt is, “βίη,” which denotes violence. Thus there is violence on the water, violence in the wine, violence in the symposium. If the ἐρόμενος turned ἐράστης wishes to exert violence on his aristocratic ἐράστης turned ἐρόμενος, that selfsame “seizing by violence” is seen

Furthermore, in discussing the phrase εἰς φιλότητα we saw in it the absence of a positive exchange. We saw the poet potentially harmed socially through the unwise actions of his ἐρόμενος turned ἐράστης. The Theognidean poet later remarks similarly, thereby driving home his point at the (relative) beginning and (relative) end of the corpus.

(1359-1360)

χρῆ γάρ τοι περὶ παῖδα πονούμενον εἰς
φιλότητα
ὥσπερ κληματίνῳ χεῖρα πυρὶ προσάγειν.

For he that is concerned with a lad for
friendship's sake must surely put his hands as
it were to a fire of vine-loppings²⁸.

²⁷ J.M. Edmonds

²⁸ Vine loppings are understood by Gerber to burn with particular heat and without true duration. pg. 380: Gerber, Douglas E. "Theognis." Greek Elegiac Poetry

If the Theognidean poet seems to intentionally place in his corpus references linking themes of βίη and erotic φίλος relationships, and potentially placing these themes into sympotic environments, this seems relevant to understanding (erotic) relationships at symposia. Part of this understanding necessarily follows here as these erotic relationships being tied with violence and inherent dangers on behalf of the ones pursuing. The dangers of violence as the metaphor for burning one's hand appear specifically to speak to the gift relationships practiced at the time in the context.

In conclusion, lines 371-372 of the Theognidean corpus convey erotic tones. This couplet exhibits these themes through notions of φίλος, agricultural metaphor, and explication of force being necessary to lead the Theognidean poet further down the path his ἐρόμενος is leading him on.

In the Theognidean couplet 371-372, we defined the erotic context by finding the cultural indicators to validate our interpretation.

579-582

ἐχθαίρω κακὸν ἄνδρα, καλυψαμένη δὲ
πάρειμι

σικρῆς ὄρνιθος κοῦφον ἔχουσα νόον.

ἐχθαίρω δὲ γυναῖκα περίδρομον, ἄνδρα τε
μάργον

ὃς τὴν ἀλλοτρίην βούλετ' ἄρουραν ἀροῦν.

She: I hate an evil man, and having been
veiled I pass by,

keeping my mind light as a little birds'.

He: And I hate a woman running around,
and a madman who another's field wishes to
plough.

Here in 579-582, the theme is more apparent given the earthy erotic imagery that has transcended time, “a man... plough[ing] another's field,” is understood as an erotic metaphor, especially when taking into consideration the word ἄμαξα in the analysis of lines 371-372. Below I shall analyze the erotic themes in 579-582.

While previously we began with “εἰς φιλότητα,” this time let us begin with “ἐχθαίρω κακὸν ἄνδρα.” An ἐχθρός is an enemy in a personal sense, while πολέμιος would mean one's enemy on a nation-state level. A πολέμιος can still be a guest-friend or otherwise, as seen when Ajax and Hector exchange gifts despite being enemies (*Iliad* 299-302). This sort of thing would not happen with an ἐχθρός, because an ἐχθρός is one who is hateful to one or hated by one. My reference to this Iliadic passage is intended to help build the context of comparison between ἐχθρός and πολέμιος, and show the personal nature of the poet's (and the narrator's) detestation of the evil man by comparison to the nation-state level πολέμιος versus the personal nature of ξένος relationships bridging to an extent the divide between πολέμιοι. There is a much greater personally emotive engagement in the naming of someone your ἐχθρός than in naming someone your πολέμιος. Thus, when the poet says, “ἐχθαίρω,” he

literally says that he detests something. Since Theognidean poetry is paradigmatic of sympotic poetry of the era, it is likely that the *κακὸν ἄνδρα* would be a relevant theme or a personally relatable trope that would be seen fairly often. Thus, when the poet says that he detests an evil man, there is a pre-existing context within which his displeasure has been circumscribed. However, it is not the male poet that is speaking herein presently. Instead, the voice in the poem's first couplet is that of a woman. "*καλυψαμένη,*" and "*ἔχουσα*" are both feminine participles, indicating that a woman is speaking. So when the poet says, "I hate an evil man," it is not he that speaks, but a woman. Suddenly, the tone of the first couplet changes entirely, a female agent expressing displeasure with an evil man tacitly expresses pleasure with a good man, one that she has at home or in mind. The opposite of hate or detestation being love or adoration, and this in connection with a man who is not *κακὸν* remains in the listener's mind.

The female agent veils herself to the evil man as she passes him by (*καλυψαμένη δὲ πάρειμι*). Women being veiled in public so as to avoid immodesty and sexual attention outside the bounds of normed marriage contracts is not abnormal in that time or now. It does, however, indicate a certain degree of social status, as a woman who works will be less likely to be particularly concerned with putting her hair up and issues of modesty than an upper-class woman who is going out for an erstwhile reason. This woman veiling herself so as to avoid unwanted attention, while also not abnormal, is another place where we can see the inverse image from the imprinting on the face of the coin. When the woman is not out on the street going somewhere, she would be

at home- her hair and head would be unveiled, and it would not be unlikely that she would take great pride in the qualities her hair possessed. But at home too, within the bounds of the marriage contract, her husband would be allowed to see her uncovered and that would likely be something that was seen as erotic. Ergo, intentional veiling to reduce one's erotic impact with a *κακὸν ἄνδρα* is not only normal but expected.

To wrap together some of the ideas presented in these first two lines, the themes are not intensely erotic, given that she hates the evil man, that she veils herself. But these themes of fidelity are also themes that would allow for a normed, healthy sexual relationship to exist between a husband and a wife. Thus it circumscribes to an extent the way a woman would become erotically desirable within the cultural context of Archaic Greece.

The second couplet begins much the same way as the first, the poet explicating that he, through another's mouth, hates the woman who runs around (*ἐχθαίρω δὲ γυναῖκα περίδρομον*). But while in the first couplet, there were feminine participles which revealed the voice of the speaker being a female and thereby not the poet, there is not this same sort of evidence in second couplet. Thus, the speaker may be the poet, or it may not be; J.M. Edmond's translation of Theognis posits that the second speaker is a male. The content of the poem echoes this idea; such a woman would be treated with a degree of hostility because she and her illegitimate Boyren pose a threat not only to one's legitimate Boyren and their inheritance but also one's social station, including her

own. These two factors are ones that would be extant despite the gender of the one holding the hostility for the woman who runs around.

Further, the theme of unsavory characters threatening the socially acceptable sexual (erotic) relationships continues with the poet describing the man who wishes to plough another's field as a madman (ἄνδρα τε μάργον). An analysis of the phrase concerning the man who ploughs another's field will follow. The word translated as madman, μάργον, has several definitions that flavor it uniquely. The Liddell-Scott adds definitions of greedy or gluttonous (relating to appetites) or lewd and lustful, both of these latter are specifically attributed to Theognis and Euripides. Here we are focusing on Theognis. This madman, therefore, is someone who is upsetting the status quo, and also he is someone whose sexual appetites are substantial. This sort of man could have a similar effect as the woman who runs around on normed family and social relationships. Thus here too there is a commentary on acceptable sexual relationships being moderated and occurring within certain socially circumscribed boundaries. A socially acceptable erotic relationship for men too is tacitly described as one which stays within its bounds. See end of analysis for additional support from Chantraine's Dictionnaire Etymologique de la Langue Grecque.

Therefore, if a socially acceptable erotic relationship for men is described as one which stays within its bounds, the man who ploughs the field belonging to another (ᾧς ὄς τὴν ἀλλοτρίην βούλετ' ἄρουραν ἀροῦν), does not stay within his bounds is not socially acceptable. Those bounds are where "the field" is

understood as one's socially accepted sexual partner (wife/ other amorous partners who are not also another's). The man who goes outside his bounds in pursuing ones who are acceptably affiliated to others upsets the status quo. This man upsets normal erotic relationships, normal familial relationships, and normal courses of action with regard to succession/ inheritance. Yet there remains an interesting absence here. The man is only a madman if the field he ploughs belongs to another (τὴν ἀλλοτρίην). The man who runs around with ones who are not acceptably affiliated to others does not upset the status quo, thereby. Suddenly, there is introduced a much broader pool of individuals with whom a man may be promiscuous while keeping the women in an unequal state, as they are tied more closely with the one whom they are specifically affiliated. This is not to say that it is acceptable to "plow" those who do not belong to others, but that it doing so does not cross social limits.

The second couplet stands in a clearly erotic context, by virtue of the couplet that precedes it, as well as its own content's implications. In the first couplet, the themes suggested the normed circumscribed area within which a (free, citizen-related) woman became erotically desirable in an Archaic Greek context. Yet while these implications lingered in the audience's mind, the second couplet suggested the (albeit more open and flexible) man's sexual bounds, limited artificially and socially. Those bounds have less to do with fidelity and more to do with not violating that which belongs to another.

In conclusion, the points we are making are being derived from what is being said- how a woman treats a bad man informs us on how she would not treat a good man, ideally. So that when the woman says that she veils herself passing by, we gain the perspective of a woman of a particular class who would be inclined to avoid a man who does not fall within her purview of goodness. The woman's role in socially normed erotic relationships is suggested by negative statements. The woman does not treat (καλυψαμένη) with a κακὸν ἄνδρα. Yet the man's role in socially normed erotic relationship is suggested by (ironically, given the language) a positive. The man may treat with those who are not affiliated in a socially normed contract with another. The poet says that he hates an adulterous man- and if a man chooses to stay within socially normed erotic relationships— not coupling with someone already in a contract or erotic relationship with someone else- he is not adulterous and thereby the satiating of his sexual desires is acceptable. The poet too says that he hates a promiscuous woman- it is not immediately clear why the poet would hate a promiscuous woman, but we do know that women outside of one's socially acceptable circle of sexual partners poses a risk to the legitimate Boyrens' inheritance. So too would a promiscuous woman pose challenges to the poet's social station, as she is forcing men to unwittingly break the social boundaries protecting one's sexual partners from interlopers.

A spring is an evocative image of purity, of the wilderness perhaps, and the fulfillment of a physical need.

959-962

ἔστε μὲν αὐτὸς ἔπινον ἀπὸ κρήνης
μελανύδρου,
ἠδὺ τέ μοί τι δόκει καὶ καλὸν εἶμεν ὕδωρ:
νῦν δ' ἤδη τεθόλωται, ὕδωρ δ' ἀναμίσγεται
ὔλη:
ἄλλης δὴ κρήνης πίομαι ἠδυσπότου.

So long as I alone drank of the black-watered
spring,
the water thereof methought was sweet and
good;
but now 'tis all fouled and the water mixed
with mud.
I'll drink from another and a purer spring.

There is a metaphor here too with erotic undertones. The analysis of this poem helps draw in pastoral and agricultural themes into the discussion on eroticism in the Theognidean corpus.

Sources of fresh water were where early humanity settled, due to its life-giving properties. Thus even when the Theognidean poet speaks of a spring, there was even then a tradition of the importance of sources of fresh water. This poem too is to be understood in an erotic²⁹ sense³⁰, but it is as well a poem that the audience must expend some energy to interpret. The poet may be relating a relationship to an individual, to a group; the basis (ἔρως or φιλία) is not directly understood. I choose to interpret the grammatically singular spring as a single individual, and to follow the footsteps of van Groningen³¹ although, “The absence of doubt would

²⁹ “The Symptotic Tease” by Ewen Bowie, Section 3: The *Theognidea*, pages 40-41 in *The Muse at Play: Riddles and Wordplay in Greek and Latin Poetry*, edited by Jan Kwapisz, David Petrain, Mikolaj Szymanski. De Gruyter, 2013.

³⁰ “Ici il n’ya pas de doute; le morceau est érotique” (van Groningen 1966: 364) [What work is this? Will it be in a bibliography?]

³¹ “Ici il n’ya pas de doute; le morceau est érotique” (van Groningen 1966: 364)

disappoint the singer...³² Meaning of course that the poet intended some ambiguity, but it is difficult for me to posit that a grammatically singular construction and word (that does not itself refer to a grouping; i.e. family) indicates a group.

In this poem, the spring (κρήνη) takes on a few roles. An important note is that the other definitions of κρήνη include well and fountain. With this in mind, approaching the κρήνη from the “spring” definition creates an environment of the wilderness, as the idea of the spring in mythology frequently is in the wilderness. When the translation used is “well,” the flavor we can get is of a moderately urbanized area, potentially the suburbs or in an otherwise loosely populated area. However, when “fountain,” is the definition of choice, there is a definite urban connotation. Each of these differences will invariably color the way one approaches this poem. When we consider a κρήνη as a spring, its pollution by mud is more natural, as mud exists near springs in nature. With the κρήνη as a well, its pollution by the mud is one that has seeped between the cracks (between the rocks of the walls) or that has been deliberate in some fashion, potentially even implying poor construction of the well (mud leaking up from underneath). The fountain κρήνη, though, is not likely to experience mud in the same way a spring or a well would. A fountain in an urban environment would likely be polluted by intentional actions of an agent which would, distinctly of the actual mud polluting the fountain’s water, pollute the fountain’s water. Thus when

³² “The Symptotic Tease” by Ewen Bowie (pg 41)

we begin to consider the interpretations, physical and metaphorical, of the κρήνη, it is necessary too to consider the way we wish to define κρήνη. For the purposes of this analysis, it seems most appropriate to consider κρήνη in the context of a fountain for the implications of its pollution are the most identifiably intentional. However, it is necessary too to respect the tradition of vaunting the pastoral simplicity and the eroticism which make take place in pastoral environments.

Worth remembering too are the scenes of defilement (Iliad 16.160) and sadness (Iliad 9.14, 16.3, and 21.257) that “μελανύδρος” is used to emphasize in epic poetry. These themes would have been remembered by the poet, and would have shaped the way he thought of the spring, by defining it as μελανύδρος. If we look further in the Theognidean corpus for evidence of springs, the way he and thereby we understand them in his work, we will be able to draw the correct conclusions and definitions for the κρήνη. Consider the following lines:

(1249-1252)

παῖ, σὺ μὲν αὐτῶς ἵππῳ, ἐπεὶ σκιρτῶν
ἐκορέσθης
αὐθις ἐπὶ σταθμοῦς ἤλυθες ἡμετέρους
ἠνίοχόν τε ποθῶν ἀγαθὸν λειμῶνα τε
καλὸν
κρήνην τε ψυχρὴν ἄλσεά τε σκιερά.

Lad, thou art like unto a horse, because now
that
thou hast had thy fill of frolicking thou art
come again to my stall desiring a good rider, a
fair meadow, a cool spring, and a shady
grove.

Concerning the ever-important diction, we have here two strong examples that neatly sandwich our subject of scrutiny, κρήνη. ἄλσεά from ἄλσος, meaning grove or glade, and λειμῶνα from λειμών meaning a grassy place or a meadow.

Meadows and glades are often enough found in forests and the great expanses of the world untamed that we are able to feel free to call them wilderness images. And with such imagery surrounding κρήνη, we may too assume that the Theognidean poet intends us to understand the spring in the same context. This context is one that concerns a place of rest, relaxation, an almost ideal oasis for the lad/ horse who has run freely, and is now tired of doing so. He wishes now to relax in this cool, shaded, watering place. He relaxes with the one who holds the reins.

Understanding the spring as something that must be intentionally defiled if it is to be defiled allows the pursuit of analysis. There are two interpretations upon which we will look: the physical and the metaphorical. The first interpretation is the physical. The poet finds an unpolluted spring and is able to be nourished. The important verbs here (τεθόλωται, ἀναμίσγεται) that tell of the water being fouled and being mixed are passive in voice. There is not a specific agent. I would still yet posit that there is an intentional agent. My argumentation is simple: natural processes would be able to pollute the spring, but they did not. A spring is a, “place of rising or issuing from the ground, the source or head, of a well, stream, or river; the supply of water forming such a source” (OED) In this case, if a natural process were to pollute the spring, the perpetual issue of water from the ground that leads into a body of water (lake, river, stream) would dilute the pollution and it would in time cause itself to become unpolluted once more. However, if an agent were to pollute the spring

(as opposed to something else), the pollution would be intentional and would be constant so as to keep the spring polluted. Therefore although the verbs (τεθόλωται, ἀναμίσγεται) that relate the pollution of the spring are passive in voice and without a specific subject, it can be inferred that the pollution of the spring was the work of an active, intentional agent. This agent pollutes the spring that the poet has become accustomed to coming to and the poet is therefore in danger of having this transgression affect his health. Ingesting mud is not generally seen as a healthy option when needing to consume water. The second interpretation is the metaphorical. The poet is interacting with an erotic object who becomes affected or influenced by an external quantity. Because the external quantity is an imposition and transgression upon the poet, the external quantity is also a pollutive quantity. The erotic object thus polluted, the poet must venture away from it in order to find an erstwhile undefiled erotic object so as to not transgress himself in a broader societal sense.

If we look to some of the ideas being presented with the previously analyzed poems, we note eroticism taking place within socially circumscribed limits, and among these, there is a repetition of the boundary of one's erotic liberty where another ends their erotic liberties. One notion is not to pursue a woman already in a socially sanctioned contract with a man, generally in the sense of a marriage. Another is not to pursue an erotic object of another in a more general sense as well, nor should that erotic object have a plurality of patrons. Hence, when the spring is an erotic object, and the poet is partaking of it alone, he is engaging in a socially accepted erotic relationship. He is not

imposing himself onto another's space. This is so that when the mud becomes a pollutant in the spring, the mud is imposing itself on the space and erotic relationship with the spring of the poet. The mud here is the presence of a competitor with the poet for the attentions of the spring/ erotic object.

In contrast, it is possible that this quatrain is intended to be a political metaphor or a reference to the *nouveau riche* who spoil the old money's society (43-52, 53-60). A good reason to consider this is if we take the spring (despite the grammatical singularity of it) to be describing a plural group of people. Should the spring be representative of a body of people, for example the πόλις/ symposium, and if one such as is described in 43-52 were to be seen by the poet to be defiling his city/ symposium (the spring), the poet would be similarly inclined to look on such an event poorly and consider leaving the spring for another one. "Κρήνης," could refer to wine, as it does in Euripides' *Bacchae* (line 707), which then would make the symposium/ πόλις connection to this poem stronger. However, the context (the poems which exist around it) in which it is found (949-954 is understood to be erotic, it even being said that this is, "seen as likely by many modern interpreters."³³)(939-942) would suggest that this is in fact an erotically directed poem. Bowie even suggests that these three poems (939-942, 949-954, 959-962) may have come from a previous collection that "privileged poems about *eros*."³⁴

³³ "The Symptotic Tease" by Ewen Bowie (41)

³⁴ "The Symptotic Tease" by Ewen Bowie (41)

This spring is not an evocative image of purity, nor of the fulfillment of a physical need, despite having begin as an image of purity. This is a direct result of its defilement by means of an unwanted lover (or an unwelcome political opponent). The erotic metaphor here is one of transgression against the poet and the boundaries of normed erotic relationships.

Appendix 3 : Woman in Theognis

Presently we will examine Woman in the Theognidean corpus, specifically the term “woman” (γυνή, γυναικός). We will examine the grammatical functions of words relating to woman and what the purpose of such constructions is. We will examine the social contexts of Woman in the poems. As there are so few poems with women explicitly mentioned, we can afford to look at them all.

We begin to look at the presence of Woman in the Theognidean corpus and the grammatical function of the words relating to Woman. In the Theognidean corpus, the term for woman appears as a noun, and as such may occupy nominative or oblique position grammatically: as the subject of the verb or as an object of it (direct or indirect). As a result of this, we will be examining nounal Woman and her relation to verbs and other nouns in the poems where she exists, specifically, the context of Man as previously analyzed.

In 119-128, Woman appears as a possessive (there is a noun that Woman is modifying to make it her own), “the mind of a woman,” being spoken of with parallel reference to the mind of a man. In 579-584, Woman appears as a direct object of the relevant verb, the action being attributed to the poetic voice directly affects the Woman. In 1225-1226, Woman occupies comparative position, being compared to another quantity. This quantity is not _X_ than a good wife (woman). In 1367-1368, the terms that refer to Woman are indirect objects, in this case, the meaning is to a degree possessive, relating to the subject of the implied verb instead of to the direct object of the verb. These have been the examples of

oblique uses of Woman, so we will now look at the two examples in the corpus of nominative Woman. In 183-192, nominative woman is used to give the woman social agency in the situation the poet is constructing. In 457-460, Woman occupies again a nominative position, she too is the subject of the poem in general.

As we discussed in the previous section looking at Man, nominative or oblique position of these nouns is representative to a degree of their agency as in reference to a verb. A noun in oblique position has lesser agency than a noun in a nominative position. We are seeing too with these examples of Woman that there is more than Woman being represented as the subject of the verb or as a direct/ indirect object. She is also occupying, within the oblique spectrum, genitive position. This indicates that the woman is being compared to something, possessive of something, or a part of a larger whole. Frequently in English we use the preposition, “of,” to create the genitive position.

Genitive Woman appears in the Theognidean corpus in 119-128 and 1225-1226. In 119-128, Woman appears as a genitive in parallel reference to genitive man:

125-126
οὐ γὰρ ἂν εἶδείης ἀνδρὸς νόον οὐδὲ
γυναικός,
πρὶν πειρηθεῖης ὥσπερ ὑποζυγίου...

125-126
For you do not know the mind of man nor of
woman before you have tested it like a yoke
animal...

Both woman and man are here occupying space that has them as references to the sort of minds being spoken of. “The mind of woman,” means that the mind is

the woman's, it is her mind, which makes this oblique noun a possessive genitive. The poet is using Woman to describe a feature of women, just as he is here using Man to describe a feature of men. In 1225-1226, Woman appears as an oblique as a genitive of comparison.

1225-1226

οὐδέν, Κύρν' ἀγαθῆς γλυκερώτερόν ἐστι
γυναικός:
μάρτυς ἐγώ, σὺ δ' ἐμοὶ γίγνου
ἀληθοσύνης.

1225-1226

Cyrnus, nothing is more sweet than a good
woman.
I am a witness; you become for me a witness
of this truth.

What genitive of comparison means is that the genitive in this case means, “than a woman,” and woman is modified by the word expressing the idea of socially relevant goodness, making the idea, “than a good woman.” In the first example, Woman is possessive of the same sort of mind in reference to the truth of friendship as Man. Woman is being compared in this small area to being of the same sort as the masculine quantity which has greater social agency. And in the second example, comparative woman occupies a superlatively positive position, being the most sweet thing. With these two examples, the Theognidean poet seems to be representing Woman in a fairly positive light, or at the least, he presents the everywoman as equal to the everyman, and a good woman as the most sweet. Woman seems to occupy to the Theognidean poet a positive emotional space when she occupies an oblique genitive position.

We will now examine nominative and objective oblique woman. The poems we will use to look at these are 183-192 and 1367-1368. In 183-192, the

Theognidean poet is talking about a good man's willingness to marry the bad daughter of a bad man if he receives as dowry many possessions, and a woman not refusing marriage to a bad man if he be wealthy. The poet goes on to say that it is better to be good than rich.

185-188

...γῆμαι δὲ κακὴν κακοῦ οὐ μελεδαίνει
έσθλός ἀνὴρ, ἦν τις χρήματα πολλὰ διδῶ:
οὐδὲ γυνὴ κακοῦ ἀνδρὸς ἀναίνεται εἶναι
ἄκοιτις
πλουσίου...

185-187

A good man does not care for the evil
daughter of an evil man,
if the man give him many things:
Nor does a woman refuse to be spouse of an
evil rich man.

Apart from the sad validity of what the poet is saying, what happens in this excerpt of this poem is really quite interesting. The actions of Man as an agent are being directly compared to the actions of Woman as agent in reference to marriage and the acquisition of wealth or possessions. In fact, in line 186 and 187, the nominative forms of Man and Woman respectively occupy two metrical positions by virtue of both having two syllables. Furthermore, they both occupy the same metrical positions as they both directly follow words with two syllables themselves. Man and Woman are occupying, therefore, the same metrical space as well as degree of agency. The man is choosing to marry the woman on account of the wealth of her father. The woman is choosing to marry the man on account of his wealthy. The agency between the Man and Woman are equal. Let us see if oblique woman is treated as well as nominative woman. In 1367-1368 (as with 579-584), oblique woman is not treated as well as nominative or genitive oblique woman. In fact, she is described as:

1367-1368

παιδός τοι χάρις ἐστί, γυναικὶ δὲ πίστις
ἐταίρη
οὐδεμί', ἀλλ' αἰεὶ τὸν παρέοντα φιλεῖ.

1367-1368

There is for you joy of a Boy, but there is not
one trust for a woman companion.
But always she loves the one being nearby.

While a Boy (likely as an erotic object) is described as a source of joy, the woman occupying an oblique position is described as being not at all one in whom the poetic voice can trust, as she has allegiance to the ones nearby, rather than the ones with whom she has developed a relationship with. The Boy, if we are to take this context as being erotic and therefore pederastic, is a male Boy. Thus, the male quantity with whom the poetic voice is having relationships with is put in on a pedestal by comparison to the female quantity. This, however, is a direct result of the female quantity being sexually available to whomever is nearby. In 579-584, the hatred for the woman is on the same grounds. She, “runs around,” which is a metaphor for promiscuity that has literally not been lost in translation.

Oblique woman as the direct or indirect object is held in a negative light for her sexual promiscuity. However, nominative woman is lauded as being good, and is given equal agency to a male agent. Further, oblique woman occupying a genitive position is referred to positively as well. On the whole, the Theognidean poet seems to be representing women in a positive light, speaking more about good women and women with agency than bad women who are socio-sexually transgressive.

If we are looking at Woman here for the purpose of understanding the way the Theognidean poet understood and expressed eroticism, it seems that he is representing erotic or sexually available women in a negative light. It is the

sexually unavailable or, “morally upright” women that are described in the positive terms of which we’ve been speaking. The social contexts, then, of the women being described is also being to a degree explicated. The adjective good (ἀγαθή) means (LSJ): well born, gentle, brave (courage was attributed to the upper echelons of society), capable in reference to ability, and good in a moral sense. A good woman then is well born among the elites of the city-state, capable, and morally good. Moral goodness being a social construct which her community places on her for her conduct being in line with what they want to see out of a woman of her standing. The good women and the women with agency are thereby define in part by being sexually unavailable. The women who are engaging in sex outside the confines of their marriages are defined as bad, faithless, and detestable; further, they are seen as transgressive, much like men who behave similarly. Since we are examining erotic contexts in Theognidean poetry, it would seem that since women who are available for sex are looked upon negatively, it may follow that sex with women is looked upon negatively, with the exception of one’s wife for the purpose of procreation.

Appendix 4 : Man in Theognis

This next section will speak to the presence of men in the Theognidean corpus, specifically, the word “man” (άνήρ, άνδρός). There will be a short

discussion of masculinity in the context of the audience of Theognidean poetry as well. We will examine the grammatical functions of words relating to men, and why they are the way they are. How many times do men appear in the Theognidean corpus (140)? What are the contexts, and what is generalizable about their presence? What are the social contexts of Men in the poems? Which emotional ideas are used in reference to men in the Theognidean corpus?

The selected poems from the Theognidean corpus which we will be examining in particular (likely with additions from the larger corpus) are 579-584, 1091-1094, and 1267-1270. The word man (ἄνθρωπος) in the Theognidean corpus is only used as a noun, though it exists in a verbal form meaning to change into a man (ἀνδρῶν). Thus, we will be examining nounal man; to do so, we will be examining how man relates to the verb in the sentence/ poem: is he subject or object? There are two words for man, ἄνθρωπος and ἄνθρωπος. The former refers to an individual, the latter may refer to an individual, but it is better understood to mean mankind or humans.

In 579-584, the men being spoken of are the objects of the verb, the verb telling us that the poet is using another agent to express volition independently. In 1091-1094, the man occupies the position of an indirect object- the action is happening to, for, with, or in the man. In 1267-1270, the man is the object of the verb. As each of our examples here occupy oblique positions, we will include nominative man. In 101-104, man occupies both nominative and oblique position,

while in 145-148 substantival man occupies an oblique position, but nounal man occupies a nominative position. Nominative position indicates that the man is the one acting, and oblique position indicates that the man is the one being acted upon.

What does it mean for man to occupy an oblique position? First and foremost, it means that the man is being acted upon. Agency indicates that one has the ability to act within their environment and upon others. By virtue of a man occupying an oblique position, this indicates that the man occupies a position of lesser agency than the voice with poetic agency. Thus, meaning for man occupying nominative position is made more clear as well. This sort of man has a greater degree of agency than a man being acted upon, than oblique man. So when a man occupies the position of an indirect object, one with agency is acting and the result of the action has an effect upon the man. This makes the man of even lesser agency than the man who is acted upon.

The purpose of this distinction is to give the poetic voice agency over the man in question (when he is the object) or to give the man agency. In 101-104 this is particularly evident. Man is used in oblique position at first, because the subject of the poem is being commanded to not associate with the man. However, the tone of the poem switches and the evil man being spoken of has the agency to not save the subject of the poem from ruin, and to not share anything good he has. In this situation, the agency that nominative man has is a negative one- the ability to not do something as opposed to the ability to do something. In 145-148 too the ability of nominative man is to not be rich with

possessions ill-gotten. This poem is a positive one on the whole, the subject of the poem being encouraged to be a good man whose conduct is upright. But the ability being represented is a choice between the bad and the not bad, the not bad being defined as valued and good. The choice, then, is still the ability to not do- making the agency of the nominative man negative. The oblique position of man in 1267-1270 seems strange. The horse bears the man, rather than the man riding the horse. In this situation the horse, like the Boy who chooses to love the one being nearby, has agency over a man whom ought to have agency over it. This creates a problem situation socially as the pederastic relationship the man is engaging in is being transgressed upon by the object of his Erotic love, by the entity that should not socially have agency over him. The poet does this to reflect the reality of a situation but also because he is highlighting a transgressive episode. Man is being transgressed against by one of lower social station than himself. Thus Man with poetic agency (nominative position) has the ability to not act, and Man without poetic agency is transgressed against.

Man appears in the Theognidean corpus 140 times. What are the contexts of Man and what is generalizable about their presence? In 101-104, the context is: evil (κακὸν) and cowardly (δειλός). In 145-148, it is: pious (εὐσεβέων), righteous(ness) (δικαιοσύνη), goodness/ excellence (ἀρετή), good (ἀγαθός), and just/ observant of custom (δίκαιος). The context in 579-584 is: hate (ἐχθαίρω) and evil (κακὸν). In 1091-1094: knowing (γινώσκων), difficulty (χαλεπὸν), and becoming (γένηται). In 1267-1270, the context is: the other

(ὑστερον). Man seems to be represented both positively and negatively, indicative of reality. While Man with agency has the ability to not do, he may still be a positive element in his social environment (144-148, 1091-1094). So too may he be a negative element, transgressive (101-104, 579-584, 1267-1270). The contexts Man appears in represent the choices and actions he takes or his social station by comparison to the poetic voice. Man is an indicator of agency. The generalizable themes related to Man in the Theognidean corpus are transgression and agency.

Masculinity in the context of the Theognidean corpus is diverse, having several layers to its interpretation. The intended audience and environment of Theognidean poetry are the elite male convivial environments, symposia. As the Theognidean poet is a man speaking to men about masculinity, there is a degree of self-aware, self-defining identity among elite males. Understanding that the environment this poetry is coming into is a patriarchal slave society with limited male citizenship creates further the milieu of elite male voice and identity- frequently the only voice being represented.

The elite male audience of Theognidean poetry would have been familiar with being slighted by fickle erotic objects, with denouncing the ones who were below their station as being lesser, with experiencing diverse types of passion and love, with experiencing and being an agent of transgression- social, emotional, and physical. Many of these men would be in politically expedient marriages with little real affection between husband and wife, a focus of the

relationship being the production of heirs. Erstwhile erotic partners with whom one could find desire, pleasure, and excitement would have been sought out, and as frequently as not these relationships (if poetic representation can be taken as valid social commentary) would have been homosexual in nature.

In this situation, men in this environment and men occupying these roles would be the ones around which sexual relationships were based. In a pederastic exchange relationship, they would have the ability to provide financial or other inducement to the erotic object to engage in sexual acts with them. With women they are socially allowed to engage in sexual relationships with (primarily their wives) the expectation of their participation was that the woman would become pregnant, making even a passive role in the actual intercourse an active engagement in the outcome. With non-wife females, where there is no expectation or necessarily desire to produce (illegitimate) offspring, the purpose would be the pleasure of the act, making the man actively engaged in the process and the act itself, even were they to adopt a passive role. Certain theories of ancient sexuality suggest that men by virtue of being the penetrative partner were also the active partner, and the penetrated was by necessity of being penetrated the passive partner. I do not intend to personally contradict this, though there exist elsewhere other models that are less black and white. Regardless, active engagement does not necessitate taking the role of an active partner.

Coming back to the idea of elite self-aware, self-identifying masculinity in the Theognidean context, one of the purposes of sympotic poetry would be to

provide self-aware commentary on the shared social station and situations in which elite men found themselves. Eroticism in this context would truly be a topic as we are seeing it has been through much of this analysis so far conducted. As Theognidean poetry exhibits, an elite man had the ability and desire to talk about his sexual relationships, successful or failed, and in the case of the Theognidean poet, these would mostly be failed. Furthermore, the way men are represented in relation to terms of emotion (Eros, Aphroditic themes, Philos, Ekthros) are diverse- subject, object, participating in each of the emotional themes.

Bibliography

1. Bremmer, Jan M.. *Sympotica: A Symposium on the Symposion*. "Adolescents, Symposion, and Pederasty" (135-148) Oxford: Clarendon, 1990. Print
2. Bowie, Ewen. "The Sympotic Tease", Section 3: The *Theognidea*, pages 40-41 in *The Muse at Play: Riddles and Wordplay in Greek and Latin Poetry*, edited by Jan Kwapisz, David Petrain, Mikolaj Szymanski. De Gruyter, 2013.
3. Edmonds, John Maxwell. "Theognis." *Greek Elegy and Jambus*. Vol. 1. London: William Heinemann, 1931. Perseus Digital Library. Web. Loeb Classical Library.
4. Figueira, Thomas J., and Gregory Nagy. *Theognis of Megara: Poetry and the Polis*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1985. Print.
5. Ford, Andrew. *The Origins of Criticism: Literary Culture and Poetic Theory in Classical Greece*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 2002. Print.
6. Foxhall, Lin, and J. B. Salmon. *Thinking Men: Masculinity and Its Self-representation in the Classical Tradition*. London: Routledge, 1998. Print.
7. Gerber, Douglas E. "Theognis." *Greek Elegiac Poetry: From the Seventh to the Fifth Centuries B.C.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1999. N. pag. Print.
8. Hesiod. "Hesiod, Works and Days." Line 405. Perseus Digital Library, n.d. Web. 10 Oct. 2014.
9. Homer, A. T. Murray, and William F. Wyatt. *Iliad*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1999. Print.
10. Homère, David Binning Monro, and Thomas William Allen. *Homeri Opera*. Oxonii: E Typographeo Clarendoniano, 1920. Web. Perseus Digital Library.
11. Lanni, Adriaan, "The Expressive Effect of the Athenian Prostitution Laws," *Classical Antiquity*, Vol. 29, No. 1 (April 2010) , pp. 45-67; Published by: University of California Press. Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/CA.2010.29.1.45>
12. Liddell, Henry G., Robert Scott, and Henry S. Jones. "Greek Word Study Tool." *Greek Word Study Tool*. Perseus Digital Library, n.d. Web. 10 Nov. 2014.
13. Murray, Oswyn. *Sympotica: A Symposium on the Symposion*. "Sympotic History" (3-12) Oxford: Clarendon, 1990. Print
14. "Oxford English Dictionary." Home : Oxford English Dictionary. Oxford, n.d. Web. 10 Oct. 2014. <<http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/187725?rskey=wM9dUb&result=1&isAdvanced=false#eid>>
15. Koehl, Robert B., "The Chieftain Cup and a Minoan Rite of Passage." *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*, Vol. 106, (1986) , pp. 99-110; Published by: The Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies. Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/629645>
16. Ludwig , Paul W. , "Politics and Eros in Aristophanes' Speech: Symposium 191e-192a and the Comedies," *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 117, No. 4 (Winter, 1996) , pp. 537-562; Published by: The Johns Hopkins University Press. Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1561948>
17. Paul, Aaron J. "A New Vase by the Dinos Painter: Eros and an Erotic Image of Women in Greek Vase Painting." *Harvard University Art Museums Bulletin* 3.2, Annual Report 1993-94 (1994): 60-67. JSTOR. Web. 10 Oct. 2014.

- <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.2307/4301510?ref=no-x-route:b03615a84067224cfee18087c844dd5a>.
18. Pellizer, Ezio. *Sympotica: A Symposium on the Symposion*. "Outlines of a Morphology of Sympotic Entertainment" (177-184) Oxford: Clarendon, 1990. Print
 19. Slater, William J. *Dining in a Classical Context*. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan, 1991. Print.
 20. Slater, W. J.. *Sympotica: A Symposium on the Symposion*. "Sympotic Ethics in the Odyssey" (213-220) Oxford: Clarendon, 1990. Print
 21. T. K. Hubbard, "Popular Perceptions of Elite Homosexuality in Classical Athens," *Arion: A Journal of Humanities and the Classics, Third Series*, Vol. 6, No. 1 (Spring - Summer, 1998) , pp. 48-78; Published by: Trustees of Boston University. Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20163707>
 22. Van Groningen, B. A. *Theognis Le Premier Livre. Édité Avec Un Commentaire*. N.p.: N. V. Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers Maatschappij, 1966. Print. ASIN: B00DMFX44O

Acknowledgements

Daniel B. Levine: Thesis Advisor

David C. Fredrick: Thesis Committee member

Joshua Byron-Smith: Thesis Committee member

Joseph M. Plavcan: Thesis Committee member

My Family and Friends for emotional support and unfailing encouragement.