

CONVENTIONAL TOPICS OF INVECTIVE IN ALCAEUS*

"The perennial themes of invective are really very few: parentage, home-country, occupation, deformity, morals, dress, hair-style, pretentiousness, thievishness, treachery, cruelty, gluttony, dirt". "Die Invektive ist eine strukturierte literarische Form, deren Ziel es ist, mit allen geeigneten Mitteln eine namentliche genannte Person öffentlich vor dem Hintergrund der jeweils geltende Werte und Normen als Persönlichkeit herabzusetzen" (1).

The conventionality of much ancient invective, its essential reducibility to a few stock themes, was first properly established by Wilhelm Süss (2). His work has been fruitfully drawn on by several scholars in recent times: one thinks in particular of H. Wankel's commentary on Demosthenes' *De corona* (3) and Nisbet's on Cicero's *In Pisonem* (4). But although the latter has written that "the conventional themes of invective can already be recognised in Archilochus and Alcaeus" (5), it is still not sufficiently realised just how fully developed the rules of this subgenre were by the time of these two lyric poets. An interesting recent study of Alcaeus (6), with a very good section on his poems of

* Fragments of Alcaeus are cited by the numeration of Lobel-Page (equivalent to Voigt's), *Testimonia* by the numeration of Voigt or (in one case) Campbell.

(1) R. G. M. Nisbet, "Gnomon" 39, 1967, 69; S. Koster, *Die Invektive in der gr. und röm. Literatur*, 'Beitr. zur kl. Phil.' 99 (1980), p. 39 (henceforth referred to as Koster).

(2) Ethos, Leipzig 1910, pp. 245 ff. Referred to henceforth as Süss.

(3) Heidelberg 1976, 2 vols. Referred to henceforth as Wankel.

(4) Oxford 1961, Appendix VI, pp. 192 ff. Referred to henceforth as Nisbet.

(5) Nisbet p. 192. The two poets are linked together in this context by Julian Misop. 337B as *κουφότερα ποιῶντες αὐτοῖς ὅσα ὁ δαίμων ἐδίδου τῇ εἰς τοὺς ἀδικούντας λαιδορία*. Alcaeus' invective against Pittacus was also referred to by Aristotle fr. 75 Rose = T 471 Voigt = Diog. Laert. 2.46 *καθὰ φησιν Ἀριστοτέλης ἐν τρίτῳ περὶ ποιητικῆς, ἐφίλονεῖκε... Πιττακῶ Ἀντιμενίδας καὶ Ἀλκαῖος* and Diod. Sic. 9.12.3 *Ἀλκαῖον... πικρότατα λελοιορηκότα* (scil. Πιττακόν), and Strabo (13.67 = T 1 Campbell) who names other victims.

(6) W. Rösler, *Dichter und Gruppe: eine Untersuchung zu den Bedingungen und zur historischen Funktion früher gr. Lyrik am Beispiel Alkaios*, Munich 1980, pp. 181 ff. and 186 ff. deal specifically with 'Polemik' and Pittacus; see too p. 161 f., 175 f. etc. Referred to henceforth as Rösler. S. Koster (sup. cit. n. 1) p. 60 f. is

abuse, fails to take into account the comparative material offered by Graeco-Roman oratory and by Attic comedy (fields where invective, as Nisbet says (7), "reaches its peak"). Another recent study of invective likewise omits to perform this comparative analysis for Alcaeus (8).

It will not, then, be altogether superfluous to re-examine Alcaeus' polemical poems in this light, though I cannot pretend to an exhaustive survey. The comparative evidence from Cicero's speeches (especially the *In Pisonem*) is particularly significant since, as Nisbet himself has observed in another, slightly different, context (9), "the unity of the Graeco-Roman world is nowhere more conspicuous than in its invective".

But first a preliminary warning. The bearing of this conventional element upon the use of Alcaeus' poems as historical documents is (or should be) obvious. Nisbet, for instance, observes that "the falsity or exaggeration of... libels is generally recognised in Cicero's case" (with reference to the anti-Ciceronian invectives); that character attacks "may be made without even a pretence of plausibility"; "are conventional... and should not be too readily believed"; and could "in spite of a wealth of circumstantial detail" be "largely or completely fictitious" (10). Wankel (11) refers to analogous cases in Demosthenes' *De corona* as "reine Verleumdung" and "vollig aus der Luft gegriffen". What Dinarchus (1.49) says of Demosthenes *πρᾶγμα κατασκευάζων οὐ γεγεννημένον, ἀλλὰ ψεύδεσθαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς τολμῶν* could be extended to most ancient orators.

Critics have been rather less cautious in handling Alcaeus' libels, and the normally sceptical Page (12) can deduce from the epithet

disappointing on Alcaeus, as is A. Burnett, *Three Archaic Poets* (1983) (see my review: "CR" 34, 1984, 170 f.). Account has recently been taken of the affinities with Comedy, but rather negatively: so G. M. Kirkwood, *Early Greek Monody* (1974), p. 72 (fr. 129 "reads rather like a reference to Aristophanic passages": a point made to show the lack of "subtlety or elegance" in Alcaeus' attack on Pittacus). A good general introduction and bibliography on invective in Wankel's note on Dem. 18.129 (2.688 f.). See too his Index s. v. 'Diabole'.

(7) Sup. cit. (n. 5).

(8) Sup. cit. (n. 1).

(9) Sup. cit. (n. 1) p. 68.

(10) Pp. 193, 194, 196. For a fuller treatment of the mendacity of such comic slanders against Cleophon and Hyperbolus see Wankel, "ZPE" 15, 1974, 87 ff.

(11) On 245 (2.1078) and 261 (2.1144) respectively.

(12) Sappho and Alcaeus, Oxford 1955, p. 170 f., with reference to Diog. Laert. 1.74 (= T 469 Voigt) *φησὶ δὲ Δοῦρις* (FGrHist 76 F 75) *τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ Θράκα εἶναι*, and Suda s.v. Πιπτακός (T 469 Voigt) *υἱός...* Ἵππυραδίου Θρακός. But the likeliest ultimate source of such traditions will have been Alcaeus' own poetry

κακοπατρίδαις that one of Alcaeus' main opponents exhibited "barbarian pedigree — the father of Pittacus was a *Thracian*. The great families of Mytilene might admit a noble foreigner to their ranks as a peer". Using the same evidence Bowra concludes (13): "that Pittacus really was of humble origin is on the whole unlikely", but then accepts that "his father was in fact a Thracian". Recent scholars have rightly been less credulous: "his father was allegedly a Thracian". "In the Greek world, where Demosthenes' enemies called him a Scythian, assertions of this kind must not be taken too solemnly" (14).

We have already, then, touched upon the first of our topics:

1. "Criticisms of social background... suggestions of servile origin... (15) imputations of *ξενία*" (16).

Not merely Pittacus as *κακοπατρίδαις* (17) (if the word does mean "low-born" in fr. 348) but the sneer in *σὺ δὴ τεαύτας ἐκγεγόνων ἔχης | τὰν δόξαν οἷαν ἄνδρες ἐλεύθεροι | ἔσλων ἔοντες ἐκ τοκῶν*; (fr. 72.11 ff.) and *κῆνος δὲ παῶθεις Ἀτρεΐδα* [in fr. 70.6] belong in this category. In these (and other) cases from Alcaeus' fragments it is extremely difficult to reconstruct a coherent picture of the identity of the victim(s) of abuse or even the exact details (18); but it is relatively

(cf. Rösler p. 175 n. 155) and Thracian parentage was a stock-in-trade of invective, levelled for instance, by Aristophanes against Cleophon (Frogs 678 ff.) and accepted by later writers with what we can now see to have been a total lack of justification (cf. Dover, *Greek Popular Morality* (1974), p. 33 n. 12). On the seemingly Thracian name Hyrras see e.g. L. H. Jeffery, *Archaic Greece*, London 1976, p. 240: "it could ... be that Hyrras' mother was the Thracian".

(13) *Greek Lyric Poetry*², Oxford 1961, p. 151.

(14) O. Murray, *Early Greece* (1980), p. 152; A. Andrewes, *The Greek Tyrants* (1956), p. 94. For a comparable case where slanders about Gallic origin have entered serious Roman historical writing (ancient and modern) see Syme, "J. R. S." 27, 1937, 130 f. = *Roman Papers* 1.34 f.

(15) Nisbet p. 194 ~ Süss p. 247 f. (1).

(16) Nisbet p. 194 ~ Süss p. 248 (2). For a selective list of comparable allegations of foreign parentage in Greek comedy see Dover (sup. cit. n. 12), p. 32.

(17) See also fr. 67.4 f. *μὴ τις τῶν κ[α]κοπατρίδαν | ἔσσειται φάνη[ρος]*. On the likely meaning of this term of abuse see Rösler pp. 186 ff. If he is right to reject the traditional view here accepted in favour of an interpretation of the word as a political term (the opposite of *εὐπατρίδης* in such a context as *ἀγαθοὶ τε καὶ εὐπατρίδαι*, of the Alcmaeonids, in an Attic Scolion, 907 P.), then it belongs with *μισόπολις* below (section 5). When the remainder of fr. 348 refers to the city of which Pittacus is tyrant as "spiritless and ill-starred" (*ἀχόλω καὶ βαρυδαίμονος*), one is reminded of various reproaches directed by orators to the citizens of Athens and in particular of Dinarchus' remark (1.91, cf. 30) that Demosthenes' continuance in politics means more bad-fortune (*ἵνα πλείω κακοδαίμονῶμεν*).

(18) See the recent discussions of fr. 70 by Rösler pp. 159 ff. and of fr. 72 *ibid.*

easy to recognise the standard modes of invective and therefore, one might suggest, more profitable to study them than attempt to reconstruct the exact contents of the original. The charges are readily paralleled. In Attic oratory we think of, for instance, Lysias' epigrammatic *δοῦλος καὶ ἐκ δούλου* (12.18 and 46), Demosthenes' supposed Scythian descent (Aeschin. 2.22, 78f., 87, 126; 3.171f. esp. 172 ad fin.; 180ff.; cf. Dinarch. 1.15, 95 etc.) or the mysterious circumstances of Meidias' birth and his true native barbarism as zestfully reported by that same orator (Dem. 21.149f.). In Roman oratory, Piso's alleged Gallic grandfather (Pis. fr. 9 Nisbet) provides a clear parallel. Attic comedy supplies numerous instances, too many to list here (19).

2. "Physical appearance was another stand by" (20).

Pittacus' pot-belly (fr. 129.21 *κῆνων ὁ φύσγων οὐ διελέξατο*) and splayed-feet (cf. fr. 429 *σαράπους*) are to be compared with Caesar's baldness (FPL p. 92), Piso's hairy cheeks and rotten teeth (Cic. Pis. 1), Vatinius' unfortunate *struma* (Cic. Vat. passim) and Cicero's own varicose veins (cf. Macrob. Sat. 2.3.5, Dio 46.18.2). From Old Comedy we are familiar with Pericles' misshapen head (Cratinus fr. 73 K-A [PCG 4.159]).

Here too are to be ranked most of the other abusive epithets (21) listed by Diog. Laert. 1.81 = fr. 429: e.g. *χειροπόδης* ("chap-footed"). *φύσγων* (also in fr. 429) and *γάστρων* ("big-belly") provide a useful transition to the next sub-section — one beloved of Hipponax: witness his reference to Cicon as a cormorant (fr. 4 W), the line *λαίμῃ δέ σοι τὸ χεῖλος ὥς ἐρωδιῷ* (fr. 118.3) and the passage on Eurymedontiades (fr. 128).

pp. 170ff. esp. p. 171 n. 147. The subject of fr. 72 has been variously identified as Pittacus, his father, his grandfather. Any of these interpretations would fit the rules of invective.

(19) The American Presidential elections of 1984 saw charges of alcoholism levelled at Ronald Reagan's father, charges of gambling levelled at Geraldine Ferraro's parents.

(20) Nisbet p. 194 ~ Süss. p. 253(8).

(21) Note that all of these are *hapax legomena*: newly-coined words are often characteristic of invective: see Koster's Index C, s. v. 'ad hoc-Bildungen'; Wankel on Dem. 18.294 (2.872). "Eccentricity of dress was another topic" Nisbet p. 194 ~ Süss p. 253(8). Greek orators animadvert on the wearing of chiton or chlamis (cf. Aeschin. 1.131 on Demosthenes' clothes). Cicero's toga was too long; and so forth. Note, therefore, *ἀγασυρτος* in fr. 429 ("well-swept", since he was slovenly and dirty" says Diogenes). Compare the description of Socrates and his pupils at Ar. Nuh. 836f.

3. "Drunkenness and gluttony" (22).

See the references to ἀκράτω and παίσαις γὰρ ὀννῶρινε νύκτας, | τῷ δὲ πίθῳ πατάγεσκ' ὁ πύθμην (fr. 72.4 and 9f.). Also fr. 70.3 ff. ἀθύρει πεδέχων συμποσίῳ. [] | βάρμος, φιλώνων πεδ' ἄλεμ[άτων] | (23) εὐωχήμενος αὐτοισιν ἔπα|. Compare Cicero's accounts of "Piso's drinking bouts" and his "fondness for dissipated and sycophantic friends" or of Antony's frequent fits of drinking and vomiting (II Phil. passim). Compare too e.g. Lysias' account (14.25) of the infant inebriation of Alcibiades the younger (παῖς μὲν ὦν... πολλῶν ὀρώωντων ἔπυνεν ὑπὸ τῷ αὐτῷ ἱματίῳ κατακείμενος, ἐκώμαζε δὲ μεθ' ἡμέραν) and Demosthenes' similar picture of the infant Aeschines (19.199) καὶ παῖδ' ὄντ' ἐν θιάσοις καὶ μεθύουσιν ἀνθρώποις κυλινδούμενον. Addressing Demosthenes Hyperides says (τοὺς νεωτέρους) ... ὕβριζες καὶ ἐλοιδοροῦ ἀκρατοκῶθωνας ἀποκαλῶν and εἰ μὲν τις ἀκρατέστερον ἔπιεν, ἐλύπει σε (fr. Or. 1 p. 24 Jensen). These vivid passages all remind us once more that "one could give an account of the activities of one's enemy which in spite of a wealth of circumstantial detail was largely or completely fictitious... Such inventions were meant to cause pain or hilarity, not to be believed" (Nisbet p. 196 f. instancing Piso's return from his drinking-din, Pis. 13). Likewise with the story Demosthenes tells of Meidias' birth: "he does not expect us to take it seriously" as Dover remarks (24). Drinking and gluttony is attributed to Cleon in Ar. Eq. 104, 280ff., 1054, 1400, to Cleonymus in Ach. 88, Eq. 956ff., 1290ff., Vesp. 952 and Av. 289 and 1477. It is one of the earliest attested topics of abuse: cf. Il. 1.225 where Achilles calls Agamemnon οἰνοβαρές.

(22) See further Aeschin. 1.26, 70; 2.4, 42, 157; and in general Koster Index C, s. v. 'Trunkenheit', pp. 195 ff.; cf. Dover (sup. cit., n. 12) p. 179. One may note that on Bowra's interpretation (sup. cit., n. 13, p. 147) Alcaeus' attacks Pittacus "for hypocrisy, for being himself given to habits which he penalised in others" (with reference to Pittacus' legislation against drunkards: Arist. Pol. 1274 b 20, Rhet. 1402 b 29). For charges of hypocrisy as a standard feature of invective see Nisbet p. 195 ~ Süss p. 251 f. (7). Note especially Dem. 54.34 οἱ μεθ' ἡμέραν μὲν ἐσκυθρωπάσασιν καὶ λακωνίζουσιν φασὶ καὶ τριβῶνας ἔχουσιν καὶ ἀπλᾶς ὑποδέδονται, ἐπειδὴν δὲ συλλεγώσιν καὶ μετ' ἀλλήλων γένωνται, κακῶν καὶ αἰσχυρῶν οὐδὲν ἐλλείπουσι and 45.80 μεθ' ἡμέραν εἰ σὺ σώφρων, τὴν δὲ νύκτ' ἐφ' οἷς θάνατος ἡ ζημία, ταῦτα ποιεῖς. Cf. in our fr. 72 παίσαις γὰρ ὀννῶρινε νύκτας.

(23) φιλώνων πεδ' ἄλεμάτων in fr. 70.4 means something like "empty charlatans". Aeschines calls Demosthenes a charlatan at 2.124 and pretentiousness is a frequent object of invective: see Nisbet p. 195 f. ~ Süss pp. 251 ff. Alcaeus called Pittacus γαῦρηξ because he was always prancing about according to Diog. Laert. 1.81 = fr. 429.

(24) Sup. cit. (n. 12) p. 86.

4. "Animal names were a favourite form of invective" (25).

Demosthenes called Aeschines a "tragic ape" (18.242). Aeschines had anticipated the compliment (2.40) (26). Demosthenes also calls Aeschines *κίναδος* (18.162). We have already encountered Hipponax's use of the word *πανδάλητος* (fr. 4 W.) and his comparison of some victim (fr. 118.3) to a ravenous heron. In Aristophanes, Cleon is made to compare himself to a dog-faced baboon (Eq. 416); in Eq. 1069 he is compared to a fox-dog (for the frequent comparison to Cerberus and other dogs see Macdowell on Ar. Vesp. 1031); he is equated with a whale at Vesp. 38. Furthermore, Chaerephon is called "the bat" at Av. 1564. Cratinus fr. 135 K-A (PCG 4.189) *ὕμων εἰς μὲν ἕκαστος ἀλώπηξ δωροδοκεῖται* is in fact very close to Alcaeus' *ὁ δ' ὥς ἀλώπα [| ποικ[ι]-λόφρων* from fr. 69.6f. (shortly preceded by mention of two thousand staters) and, more subtly, such passages as fr. 129.23f. *δάπτει | τὰν πόλιν ἄμμι* where, as Page remarks ad loc.: "the verb suggests that Pittacus is no better than a lion (Il. 11.481), wolf (Il. 16.159) or dog (Il. 23.183)". See too fr. 70.6f. *κῆνος δὲ παώθεις Ἀτρεΐδα[.].[] | δαπτέτω πόλιν ὥς καὶ πεδὰ Μυρσί[λ]ω[]* and fr. 306(9) 4ff. *ἐνθορεῖν | καὶ ἐνορμ[ῆσαι τ]οῖς τ[ο]ῦ Φιτ[τάκ]ο[υ] νώτ[οις]* where, as Barner observes, "der Wortwahl nach zu schliessen, soll Pittakos hier offenbar als eine wild gewordene Bestie erscheinen" (27).

5. Another charge often levelled at political opponents was that of being *μισόφιλος* or *μισόπολις* (28). At least, that is the phraseology of Attic orators of the fourth century. The different circumstances of politics on Lesbos in the sixth century must be taken into account.

(25) Nisbet p. 196. See too Wankel on Dem. 18.127 (2.679f.), 162 (2.837f.) and 242 (2.1066f.), Koster Index s.v. 'Tiervergleich', M. Faust, "I. F." 74, 1969, 69ff., and "Glotta" 48, 1970, 8ff. On the specific issue of such abuse in Homer see the first of Faust's articles p. 109 n. 204 and I. Opelt, "Glotta" 56, 1978, 170ff.

(26) *Κέρκωψ*: cf. LSJ s.v. For a totally different interpretation of this word see P. G. Maxwell-Stuart, "A. J. P." 96, 1975, 7ff.

(27) W. Barner, *Neuere Alkaios-Papyri aus Oxyrhynchus, 'Spudasmata'* 14 (1967), p. 83f. citing the famous anecdote from Plut. mor. 147 B *κάκιστον εἶναι τῶν μὲν ἀγρίων θηρίων τὸν τύραννον*. The word *τράγον* in fr. 167.5 (cf. Barner p. 67), reference to a boar in fr. 179.7, *πάλιν ἂ σὺς παρορίνει* (fr. 393), *αἰξ Σκυρία* (fr. 435), may all belong to this sphere of thought. *ἄξιός ἀντι λέ[ο]ν[τος] ... ἥς ἀπυδέρθη* (fr. 296a.8) is less promising: see Maas, "C. R." 6, 1956, 200 = Kl. Schr. p. 4; Lloyd-Jones, "C. P." 70, 1975, 197. The use of actual animal names may seem qualitatively different from the use of language merely suggestive of animal behaviour, but there is a similar move in Latin from, for instance, *cineres* used of an old woman to the more allusive image in Horace's *dilapsam in cineres*.

(28) Süss p. 250f.(6): cf. Wankel on Dem. 18.82 (1.473).

But if we bear in mind that there are "no grounds for thinking that Alcaeus distinguished between disaster for Lesbos and disaster for his faction" (29), we will soon understand that pretty much the same charge is being levelled against Pittacus in fr. 129 where his treachery is upbraided (esp. 22 ff. *πόσῳ | ἔ]μβαις ἐπ' ὀρκίοισι δάπτει | τὰν πόλῳ*). An analogous accusation must underlie fr. 69. In similar mode, Dinarchus (1.33 and 41) describes Demosthenes as οὐδέν... χρήσιμος ἀλλ' ἢ τοῖς ἐχθροῖς κατὰ τῆς πόλεως and προδότην τῶν φίλων καὶ τῆς πόλεως ἀνάξιον καὶ αὐτὸν καὶ τὴν περὶ τοῦτον τύχην γεγεννημένην (cf. Dem. 18.180). The same author's description of the same politician as a breaker of oaths (1.47; cf. Antiphon 6.33, Lycurg. in Leocr. 77, Dem. 19.126, 191) is very close in spirit to Alcaeus. And when Dinarchus (1.30) says *ἔχοι τις ἂν εἰπεῖν ἢ ὑμῶν ἢ τῶν περιεστηκότων, εἰς ποῖ οὗτος πράγματ' εἰσελθὼν ἢ ἴδια ἢ κοινὰ οὐκ ἀνατέτροφεν*; and Aeschines (3.158) *τὴν πόλῳ ἄρδην ἀνατετροφότα*, the final verb reminds us of Alcaeus' warning (fr. 141) *ῶνηρ οὗτος ὁ μαϊόμενος τὸ μέγα κρέτος | ὀντρέψει τάχα τὰν πόλῳ*.

6. In a context such as the present, the famous Cologne ode of Alcaeus (30), with its paradigmatic myth of Locrian Ajax, may seem irrelevant — until we think of the use by the Attic orators of mythology as a source of abuse. A famous and fairly elaborate type is to be found in Andocides *De myst.* 129 *ἀλλὰ γὰρ τῷ παιδί αὐτοῦ τί χρὴ τοῦνομα θέσθαι;... τίς ἂν εἴη οὗτος; Οἰδίπους ἢ Αἴγισθος; ἢ τί χρὴ αὐτὸν ὀνομάσαι;* (31). Cf. *Ps.-Andoc.* 4.22 of a child *ὃς τοσοῦτῳ παρανομωτέρως Αἰγίσθου γέγονεν*. Aeschines called Demosthenes "this Sisyphus" (4.23): the motif is already on its way to being boiled down to the type of epigram represented in Greek by *ἄρουραῖος Οἰνόμαος* (Dem. 18.242) (32) and in Latin (33) by *Palatina Medea* (Cic. *Cael.* 18) or

(29) Kirkwood *sup. cit.* (n. 6) p. 54. Demosthenes too was probably a stranger to the distinction. For an assertion of the identity of the speaker and the polis as regards the opponent's enmity cf. Dem. 18.125 *ὄρα μὴ τούτων μὲν ἐχθρὸς ἦς ἐμοὶ δὲ προσποιῇ*.

(30) Note Rösler's heading for his section on this poem (p. 204): "Pittakos, ein zweiter Aias". On such phrases (*ἄλλος τις Αἴας, δεύτερος* vel sim.) see Headlam on Herodas 4.56 ff. G. Tarditi, "Q. U. C. C." 8, 1969, 96 notes the poem's links with invective.

(31) For a bibliography of the use of mythological exempla in Attic oratory see N. Zagagi, *Tradition and originality in Plautus*, 'Hypomnemata' 62 (1980), p. 23 n. 32; cf. Koster p. 77; Menander *Samia* 495 ff. and Sandbach *ad loc.*

(32) See Wankel *ad loc.* (2.1067 f.).

(33) See Nisbet on *Pis.* 20(19).

quadrantariam Clytaemestram. Alcaeus' use of mythology is far more elaborate, but its main aim is comparable. The *thought* behind Alcaeus' poem, that Pittacus, like Ajax, endangers the whole state by his crimes, likewise has analogies. Demosthenes calls Aeschines a *κουνὸς ἀλιτήριος* (18.159; cf. 19.226, 197) a man, whose accursedness is contagious (34); Demosthenes' enemies brought the same charge against him. Alcaeus' statement that Ajax was *mad* (v. 16 *λύσσαν... ὀλοῶν ἔχων*) is particularly interesting: "the Greeks used all their words for insanity much more freely in warning, reproach and vilification than we use our corresponding words, and mingled them with words of unambiguous reproach in the same phrase" as Dover (35) puts it. Demosthenes often refers to the madness of his opponents — especially Aeschines: Dem. 18.121 *τί σαυτὸν οὐκ ἐλλεβορίζεις ἐπὶ τούτοις*; 243 *ἐμβρόντητε, εἴτα νῦν λέγεις*; but cf. also the reference to οὗτ' ἀπόνοια Σωσικλέους οὔτε συκοφαντία Φιλοκράτους οὔτε Διώνδου καὶ Μελάντου *μανία* (ib. 249). Conversely, Hyperides addresses Demosthenes thus (5. col. 7): *ἡ γὰρ] σὴ ἀπόνο[ια, ὧ Δημό]σθηνες, ὑπ[έρ ἀπάντων] τῶν ἀδικούντων νῦν προκυνδυνεύει καὶ προαναισχ[υν]τεῖ*. Furthermore Ajax is identified as hateful to the gods (or at least to Athena), another stock motif of invective (36) (see e.g. Aeschin. 3.106 ff. — Demosthenes' sins against the gods — or Dem. 21.150 *τὸ τῆς φύσεως βάρβαρον ἀληθῶς καὶ θεοῖς ἐχθρόν*) and the statement that he (like Pittacus) should have been stoned to death reminds us that "Volkjustiz" is a common motif of invective from the earliest times: cf. Il. 3.57 (where Hector says Paris should have been stoned) and Hipponax fr. 128.3 W. *ψηφίδι < > κακὸν οἶτον ὀλεῖται* (37).

7. Süss observed that "einen überaus breiten Raum nehmen in dem Stoffgebiet der *διαβολή* sexuelle Dinge ein" (38). On occasions these

(34) See Wankel on Dem. 18.159 (2.824 ff.).

(35) Dover sup. cit. (n. 12) p. 128 f.; cf. Wankel on Dem 18.243 (2.1072). On Latin *demens* see I. Opelt, *Die lateinischen Schimpfwörter und verwandte sprachliche Erscheinungen*, Heidelberg 1965, Index s.v. (p. 269).

(36) See further on *θεοῖς ἐχθρός* as a standard term of abuse Hipponax fr. 70.7 W., Ar. Nub. 581, Fraenkel, "C. Q." 36, 1942, 54 = Kl. Beitr. 1.242, Koster p. 58 and n. 205.

(37) Usener, "Rh. Mus." 56, 1900, 1 ff. = Kl. Schr. 4.356 ff., Koster Index C, ss. vv. 'Volkjustiz' und 'Steinigung'.

(38) For standard motifs in the abuse of old women, see, for instance, V. Grassmann, *Die erotischen Epoden des Horaz, 'Zetemata'* 39 (1966), Index (p. 176) s. v. 'Vetula-skoptik'. On the rationale behind Alcaeus fr. 306, fr. 14 col. ii, note in particular the remarks of A. Henrichs, "Z. P. E." 39, 1980, 21 ("archaic mentality apparently thought that too much sexual activity would accelerate the ripening of a

allegations plumbed sordid depths as with Lysias' revelation of the liaison between the Socratic Aeschines and a seventy year old woman ἥς ῥᾶον τοὺς ὀδόντας ἀριθμῆσαι ἢ τῆς χειρὸς τοὺς δακτύλους (fr. 4 Al-bini). Compare too Andocides *De myst.* 127 ὁστέρω πάλω χρόνῳ τῆς γραδὸς τολμηροτάτης γυναικὸς ἀνηράσθη. We can hardly fail to be reminded of Alcaeus' description of an aged prostitute (fr. 306, fr. 14 col. ii).

8. Finally νῦν χρῆ μεθύσθην καὶ τινα πέρ βίαν | πῶνῃν, ἐπειδὴ κάτθανε Μύρσιλος (fr. 332). Invective often expresses a wish for the enemy's death: it follows that rejoicing at the decease of one's victim (39) is its logical conclusion. Mythically and ideally, invective led to the victim's death by suicide; Hipponax reputedly achieved this with Bupalus and Athenis (Pliny *N. H.* 36.12, ps.-Acro on *Hor. Epod.* 6.14), Archilochus with Lycambes and his daughters (Dioscorides *A. P.* 7.351, Gaetulicus *A. P.* 7.71 etc.) (40).

Conclusion. In dealing with supposedly rhetorical forms we must distinguish, as Dover has pointed out (41); "those which belong to Greek society as a whole, and may be presumed characteristic of Greek forensic and political debate long before the study of rhetoric assumed significant proportions; among them the reckless and brutal mockery common to Comedy and Oratory". Our investigation has shown just how characteristic these forms were; how early in origin, how tenacious and conservative through the centuries (42); and how easily adapted to poems of seemingly different scope such as Alcaeus' Cologne fragment.

Oxford

MALCOLM DAVIES

St. John's College

woman's body. The very thing that made women attractive would ruin them").

(39) For other examples of such rejoicing see Koster Index C, s.v. 'Totenschmä-
hung (s. post mortem)'.

(40) See G. L. Hendrickson, "A. J. P." 46, 1925, 101 ff. on "the wide-spread popular belief in the destructive power of words of ill-omened invective" and 124 ff. on "Old Irish and Arabic Analogies".

(41) "Gnomon" 33, 1961, 121.

(42) Nisbet's listing of "dress, hair-style, pretentiousness" among "the perennial themes of invective" is a further argument in favour of the traditional view of Anacreon's poem on Artemon as an attack on that individual, since it mentions all three elements. I should have alluded to this fact in my critique ("Mnemos." 34, 1981, 288 ff.) of Slater's contrary position ("Phoenix" 32, 1978, 185 ff.) where it would have been more effective than some of the "polemica davvero eccessiva" frankly castigated by B. Gentili ("Q. U. C. C." 12, 1982, 115 f.). Other frr. of Alcaeus are indicative of invective (esp. fr. 306(1).13 ff. Κλεῶνα[κτ- ἀν]αίσχυν-
[τος] | ψευσταί []) but I have confined myself to the best preserved.