Introduction

Imperial Greek Literature, Rhetoric and Lyric

At the beginning of the first century,[1] Dio Chrysostom – orator and (self-proclaimed) philosopher – kicked off one of his speeches on kingship apparently addressed to the Roman emperor (*Orr.* 1–4) with a vignette which ties politics and music together (*Or.* 1.1–2):

> φασί ποτε Ἀλεξάνδρῳ τῷ βασιλεῖ τὸν αὐλητὴν Τιμόθεον τὸ πρῶτον ἐπιδεικνύμενον αὐλῆσαι κατὰ τὸν ἐκείνου τρόπον μάλα ἐμπείρως καὶ μουσικῶς . . . καὶ τὸν Ἀλέξανδρον εὐθὺς ἀναπηδῆσαι πρὸς τὰ ὅπλα τοῖς ἐνθέοις ὁμοίως· οὕτω σφόδρα ἐπαρθῆναι αὐτὸν ὑπὸ τοῦ μέλους τῆς μουσικῆς καὶ τοῦ ῥυθμοῦ τῆς αὐλήσεως.
>
> The story goes that when the *aulos* player Timotheus gave his first exhibition before King Alexander, he showed great musical skill in adapting his playing to the king's character. . . . They say, too, that Alexander at once bounded to his feet and ran for his weapons like one possessed, such was the exaltation produced in him by the tones of the music and the rhythmic beat of the rendering.

The scene is based on a tradition which placed the *aulos* player Timotheus of Thebes at Alexander's court (cf. Ath. 12.538f); nor is Dio the only source for Timotheus' psychagogic power over the king (cf. Him. *Or.* 16.3–4).[2] This version, however, is also tailored to serve Dio's purpose: the anecdote provides an inferior comparison to what Dio is about to do and is effectively already doing; as he hastens to specify, whereas Timotheus' piping could only reignite Alexander's warlike sentiments,[3] Dio's address aims to

[1] Unless specified, dates are CE. Since I deal above all with Aelius Aristides (117–after 180), my focus will be on the second century; when useful or necessary, however, evidence and contexts earlier or later than that period will be taken into account.

[2] On Timotheus, see Stephanes (1988): n. 2417; West (1992): 366 n. 39; LeVen (2014): 32. Similar anecdotes were told about Alexander and other *aulos* players too, e.g. Plut. *De Alex. fort.* 335a. The tradition concerning Timotheus was picked up much later by John Dryden, who reimagined it in an ode in honour of St Cecilia, patron of music (*Alexander's Feast; or, the Power of musique*; 1697), then set in music by Handel (1736). Dryden, however, mistook Timotheus the *aulos* player for the more famous Timotheus of Miletus, poet and *kithara* player (16–18: 'Timotheus, placed on high | Amid the tuneful choir, | With flying fingers touched the lyre'); see Strohm (2004).

[3] Dio *Or.* 1.2 refers to Timotheus' performance as *orthios nomos* (similarly *Suda* O 573), a tune apparently characterised by high pitch: Barker (1984): 251; cf. Almazova (2020).

be inspirational for the emperor, to be identified almost certainly with Trajan, in both war and peace (4–8). No matter how different from Timotheus' music Dio wanted his speech to sound, however, it is evident that he still aspired to the same potency of inspiration exercised by the ancient musician; whether or not *Or*. 1 was ever performed before Trajan (most probably, not), what Dio portrays himself to be doing in this and the other kingship speeches is precisely striving to influence and control (Roman) power through Greek education, *paideia*.[4]

Dio's story suits my beginning at least as much as it does the opening of his speech, since it brings immediately into focus the key thematic and argumentative nexuses of this book. The first is my focus on lyric beyond just poetry and texts. Scholars have used the term 'lyric' both as including and excluding elegy and *iambos* alongside melic poetry – itself commonly divided into choral and monodic poetry.[5] As will become abundantly clear, I use 'lyric' as excluding elegiac and iambic poetry, to emphasise the full melodic vocal performance and musical accompaniment that characterised melic poetry (see μέλος, *melos*, 'song', but also 'melody, 'tune'; LSJ, *CGL*).[6] In turn, such a definition of 'lyric' cannot be limited to the melic poetry crystallised in the Hellenistic canon. As far as we know, for example, Timotheus of Thebes was not a lyric poet, and least of all one of the nine poets of the lyric canon. But Timotheus' figure and story may still be connected to lyric tradition, if by 'lyric' we mean the musical as well as poetic phenomena covered by μέλος, and by 'tradition' a gamut of expressions ranging from poems to performances, poetic tropes, musical icons and the stories told about them.[7] So defined, lyric tradition functioned for imperial Greeks as one of the sites and matrices – though so far a largely ignored one – of their engagement with ancient Greek literature and culture more broadly.

[4] Whitmarsh (2001): 200–3; on the date, context and possible performance(s) of Dio *Orr*. 1–4, see also 186–8, with further references.

[5] Cf. Miller (1994): 81–5; Kurke (2000); Budelmann (2009b): 2–5.

[6] This sense seems to have been prevalent in antiquity too: Budelmann (2009b): 3; Nelis (2012); Ford (2020): 64–5. On the relationship between λυρικός and μέλος/μελικός, see also §0.1; for the two notions in recent lyric scholarship, cf. Fearn (2020): 73.

[7] Timotheus may seem an *extreme* example to illustrate a notion of lyric that includes music: in Dio, his performance is purely instrumental, which would make him a musician rather than a lyric (i.e. melic) performer. As pointed out by Budelmann (2009b): 9, however, 'there will have been some degree of continuity between lyric and what we would conceptualise as just instrumental music'; not to mention that the *nomos* performed by Dio's Timotheus may be considered a lyric form (cf. Carey (2009): 26). Besides Dio, furthermore, Ath. 12.538f lists Timotheus among the *aulos* players performing with choruses (i.e. accompanying choral songs) at Alexander's Susa weddings. All in all, then, Dio's story helps me emphasise the centrality of music to my approach, while still activating a lyric connection.

The second nexus concerns the relationship between lyric and rhetoric. As suggested by Dio's choice of comparison, this relationship was potentially a close one: the activities of both singer (or musician *tout court*, in Timotheus' case) and orator were framed by and dependent on specific, and special, occasions, such as a court performance or an address to the emperor.[8] In such contexts, both musical performers and orators would deploy their skills to seduce and/or persuade their target audience – an aspect Dio is well aware of, when he evokes Alexander's reaction to Timotheus' music as the precedent for Trajan's response to *Or.* 1.

At the same time, the general kinship between rhetoric and lyric as genres 'of presence' depending on occasion justified a certain agonistic tension: as seen, Dio takes pains to explain that his speech will be more useful to the emperor than Timotheus' rousing tune was to Alexander; the orator's effectiveness is defined in competition with the musical performer's. This sense of competition was heightened by the fact that lyric performances were all but limited to ancient traditions: imperial orators still vied with contemporary singers and musicians for audience appreciation, and Dio himself was one of the most vocal speakers on the issue (see e.g. *Or.* 19.1–2, discussed in §2.3.1).

Last but far from least: power. Dio's text well exemplifies the entanglement between lyric and music, rhetoric and (imperial) politics. Precisely because both forms of performance were framed by occasion and were therefore characteristically situated within certain social and political contexts, lyric performances shared with rhetoric the potential for engagement with power. In particular, when taken as (agonistic) model or precedent for imperial rhetoric, lyric could mobilise distinctive political discourses, as in the case of Dio's Timotheus and the function of his music as inspiring and leading the ruler, which are then reflected, with marked differences, in Dio's own attempt to steer imperial behaviour. All of this, then, could be further complicated by the fact that Roman power and rulers – most (in-) famously Nero, but other emperors as well – interfaced with and appropriated some specific Greek lyric traditions for their political agendas and as vehicles for Roman imperial ideology.

This book pulls together these research threads – lyric tradition as broadly conceived, its relationship with rhetoric, and that with imperial politics – to offer the first sustained analysis of the presence and role(s) of lyric poetry and music within the Greek literature and culture of the

[8] This is, of course, especially true of epideictic rhetoric, traditionally associated with imperial orators through the term 'Second Sophistic', on which see p. 4.

Empire. Overall, my argument is that the place of lyric was special, marked and different from other strains of Greek tradition; crucially, this meant that lyric had the potential to contribute something different to discourses of Greek cultural identity construction, authorial self-fashioning and power negotiation between rulers and ruled. As a poetic genre, archaic and classical lyric texts showcased very individualised voices, while famous singing figures, with or without a (stable) textual tradition attached to them, lived on in the memory of imperial Greeks through myths and stories. Lyric tradition brought into play a diverse repertoire of voices and personas, together with the themes prominently associated with them (e.g. Sappho and erotic poetry; Pindar and the praise of winners; Orpheus' enchanting powers). Given their situatedness in terms of occasions and functions, moreover, lyric poems, figures and performances were uniquely tied not only to specific political contexts, as already mentioned, but also to specific locales, and thus may contribute to the expression and construction of local identities against the Panhellenic background bolstered by the Empire, and in contrast with the globalising spatial politics of Roman rule.

Ideally, therefore, lyric offered models of situatedness and distinctive voices especially to the imperial orators of the so-called Second Sophistic, who according to Philostratus' original use of the term (*VS* 481), practised epideictic (i.e. 'display') rhetoric often involving the impersonation of mythical and historical figures from the Greek past, and including a wide range of occasional pieces, such as addresses to local communities, encomia, festival speeches or funeral orations.[9] Yet if and how an imperial sophist engaged with (some) lyric models depended on his agendas and self-fashioning choices, as well as on his literary knowledge. As argued extensively in Part I, archaic and classical lyric poetry was *not* part of the mainstream literary education of the period but represented a more specialised and niche form of reading. As a result, when we consider an orator's engagement with lyric as literary and textual tradition, the ability and choice to refer to precise poems must be interpreted as a statement of sophisticated positionality in itself. This could not be more true than for the

[9] Philostratus' initial definition insists on the practice of fictional declamations (the main rhetorical form requiring impersonation), but the sophists he then considers practised different subgenres of occasional rhetoric. A wider use of the term than Philostratus', to refer broadly to the panorama of imperial literature and culture, is both possible and much debated: e.g. Whitmarsh (2001): 41–5; (2005): 3–10; (2013a): 1–7; (2017); Johnson and Richter (2017b). Since my ultimate focus lies on imperial rhetoric, however, I consider the 'Second Sophistic' primarily within Philostratus' terms of definition and limit my use of related terms to markedly rhetorical contexts and figures.

protagonist of this study, the second-century Mysian sophist Publius Aelius Aristides.[10] Among contemporary orators and Greek writers in general, Aristides stands out for his extensive use of some carefully selected lyric poets, which points to his superior *paideia* as well as to his display of it. At the same time, transcending the textual dimension, Aristides' engagement with lyric encompasses the construction of his own lyric persona, the mobilisation of lyric's local significance and the appropriation of the political dimension attached to lyric poetry and performances, thus providing a unique opportunity to explore and demonstrate my argument about the specificity of lyric within imperial culture.

The breadth of these preliminary observations, however, requires a brief overview of the rationale for bringing together lyric and imperial Greek literature, in the sophistic form of epideictic oratory, besides the introductory example offered by Dio. In what follows, I shall spell out why it is worth looking at lyric and imperial rhetoric, what the ramifications are of doing so by focusing on Aristides and what such a research may contribute to our picture of imperial Greek literature and culture, as well as to our understanding of Aristides' figure and work. In the process, I shall contextualise my approach within the ever-growing scholarship on imperial Greek literature and culture, explaining in what ways it departs from the few previous treatments of the presence of lyric in imperial culture, and from their results.

0.1 (Beyond) Detecting Lyric

That lyric poetry may be present in imperial Greek literary texts is not a complete surprise. But what has been left un(der)explored, and is much more interesting and consequential, is what the presence of lyric references in texts of the period meant for the authors, their audience/readers and their cultural milieu more widely. The interest in assessing both the transmission of classical texts and the scope of imperial literary education has prompted some scholars to scan the texts of some imperial writers for quotations and allusions to archaic and classical works, including lyric

[10] Although Aristides often uses 'sophist' in a derogatory way (see e.g. *Orr.* 28.127–8; 33.29), I follow Philostratus in including him among the 'second sophists' (*VS* 581–5), as, at least from where we stand, one of the top contenders in the arena of imperial epideictic oratory. Later in his life, Aristides also took a fourth name (Theodorus, i.e. 'gift of god') to signal his close relationship with the divine – the most important component of his self-presentation, as we shall see: *Smyrna* 144*5 and *HL* 4.53, with Downie (2013): 12–14.

poets. This is the case, for instance, of Graham Anderson's research on Lucian's 'classics', which looked at the number, frequency and format of Lucian's literary quotes.[11] Some twenty years after Anderson, Aristides' own extensive use of Pindaric poetry was the subject of a dissertation by Theodoros Gkourogiannis, who produced a taxonomic repertoire of Pindaric quotations organised by function in context (encomiastic, argumentative or purely 'ornamental').[12] It has been in particular thanks to Ewen Bowie, however, that this approach has been developed into a convenient tool for studying imperial texts. In a series of papers focusing in large part on lyric, Bowie has surveyed the diffusion of textual references, more or less explicit, to melic, iambic and elegiac poems in a broad range of imperial genres and authors, primarily in order to determine how well and through what sources these writers – Philostratus, Plutarch, the novelists and Athenaeus, as well as Aristides – knew the poetic texts they were citing from.[13]

This search for lyric quotes has made a substantial contribution to the study of imperial *paideia* and of the place held within it by lyric poetry; as my own recourse to them proves (Chapter 1), the analyses carried out by Bowie and others have the unquestionable merit of providing a handy overview of the circulation and readership of lyric. Yet such a quotation-oriented approach also presents two main blind spots, which make such statistics and taxonomies more useful as a starting point than as a definitive and organic framework of interpretation. The first issue concerns the type of references this approach sets out to detect. As we have mentioned the imperial experience of lyric was by no means limited to engagement with the poetic collections of the nine canonical lyric poets selected by the influential scholars of the Hellenistic period; other singers, real and mythical, and other song traditions which had no place in the Alexandrian processes of entextualisation and canonisation continued to play a role in the lyric imagination of the Empire. In discussions centred on performance rather than on the textual dimension of poetry, furthermore, rigid Hellenistic classifications of genre could give way to a looser and less artificial picture of ancient song culture. This was the case, for instance, with the pseudo-Plutarchean *On Music*, which traces the history of lyric based on musical and performative criteria, with the result that

[11] Anderson (1976), (1978). Anderson's approach in turn might be traced back to Householder (1941).

[12] Gkourogiannis (1999); for his classification, see 9–12. On Pindaric quotes, see also Vassilaki (2005); Rutherford (2012).

[13] Bowie (1997), (2000), (2008a), (2008b), (2009), (2010), (2021).

Archilochus' recitative iambi are discussed alongside paeans and citharodic *nomoi* (*De mus.* 1131f–1141d).[14] It was precisely new, ongoing (re-)performances that completed, and complicated, the picture.

When exploring the presence of lyric in imperial literature, therefore, looking exclusively at quotations misses the fact that lyric represented a complex system of reference encompassing texts, anecdotes, poetic icons, performative traditions as well as imagery and tropes, all elements which will instead be central to my arguments.[15] As anticipated when discussing Dio's incipit, and mine, with respect to terminology my choice to include all these phenomena under the lyric umbrella corresponds to the ancient notion of μέλος, and its later derivative μελικός (*melikos*), rather than to that of λυρικός (*lyrikos*). While μέλος and μελικός applied to diverse, ancient and more recent expressions of song culture, λυρικός appears to have been introduced as a result of Hellenistic classification and accordingly tended to be used with precise reference to archaic and classical lyric poets, the canonical nine especially (see e.g. *AP* 9.184, discussed in §1.3; Heph. *De sign.* pp. 73–4 Consbruch; Clem. Al. *Strom.* 5.14.136). It fits this picture that Aristides referred to his own (therapeutic) lyric compositions as 'melic' instead of 'lyric' (*HL* 4.31: ἐνῆγεν [i.e. Asclepius] δέ με καὶ πρὸς τὴν τῶν μελῶν ποίησιν; see further §2.3.2). But since it was mapped onto the complex and varied panorama of song culture, terminology too may oscillate and vary. Galen, for example, apparently treated μελικός and λυρικός as interchangeable when referred to poets (*De usu part.* 4 p. 366.1 Kühn: παρὰ τοῖς μελικοῖς ποιηταῖς, οὓς ἔνιοι λυρικοὺς ὀνομάζουσιν).[16] At the other end of the terminology spectrum, Philostratus used λυρικός for a variety of melic and more broadly musical contexts, including contemporary songs.[17] While such variations are impossible to trace conclusively, however, the maximalist notion of 'lyric' I have adopted here essentially

[14] See Gostoli (2011). Pseudo-Plutarch's different approach from Alexandrian categories may also be a result of the fact that his sources go back to the fifth and fourth centuries BCE, thus preceding the development of Hellenistic scholarship.

[15] Most recently, Musté (2022) has included imagery as part of her survey on poetry in Aristides; her approach, however, is not substantially different from previous repertoires and classifications of Aristides' poetic references.

[16] It is difficult to determine whether Galen had only ancient, canonical lyric poets in mind: the observation comes from a discussion of the strophic structure of lyric poems, which was not the exclusive preserve of archaic and classical poetry; Aristides followed the same strophic pattern in his μέλη (*HL* 4.31).

[17] Cf. Philostr. *VS* 515.9 (λυρικός as generically 'musical'); 620.13 (λυρικός to define the '*nomoi* for the lyre' composed by the sophist Hippodromus). For the origin and evolution of lyric terminology, see Färber (1936): 7–16, with further sources; Budelmann (2009b): 2–5.

corresponds to what (most) imperial Greeks (and Greek-speaking Romans) would have recognised as or connected to μέλος and attempts to account as much as possible for the wide range of lyric phenomena taking place under the Empire.

Once we take on an extended and more flexible perspective on lyric, furthermore, we unlock access to crucial dimensions of imperial Greek culture from an unprecedented angle; above all, we begin to appreciate how and why lyric tradition(s) fed into the processes of tradition and identity (re-)construction through which imperial Greek authors and audiences (i.e. civic communities, readers etc.) carved their place in relation to both their Greek past and imperial, Roman but also globalised present. This is the second, and more critical, blind spot in works on imperial habits of lyric quotation. Given their interest in issues of knowledge and circulation of archaic and classical poetry, studies centred on quotation patterns and distribution have programmatically avoided major questions concerning the literary agendas and cultural politics of the quoting authors.[18] To put it in other words, the focus on defining lyric knowledge has upstaged issues of lyric 'knowingness', understood as the shrewd display of the literary and cultural value of lyric by imperial writers.[19] Yet, in the last thirty years or so, groundbreaking and still-expanding scholarship on imperial Greek culture has exposed more and more the constructedness of identity(ies) within imperial literature and society, illuminating how the sense of the past of individual writers, social groups and cities functioned as a productive tool to shape their self-presentation and, as integral to this, their engagement with Roman rule.[20] Just like the identities that they contributed to form and fashion, Greek tradition and *paideia* were not stable realities but were continuously appropriated, adapted, de- and re-constructed as part of the

[18] Arguably, issues of rhetorical agenda are touched upon in the analysis of Aristides' Pindaric quotes by Gkourogiannis (1999), but his observations are very limited as he merely takes into account the immediate context where quotes occur. The importance of context and purpose has been recognised by Bowie (e.g. (2008a): 21); nonetheless, Bowie's focus remains predominantly on sources and format of citation. For discussions of Aristides' Pindaric reception which pay attention to the sophist's self-presentation aims, cf. instead Downie (2009) and (2013): 128–54.

[19] On 'knowingness' as the 'glue of social discourse' (722), cf. Goldhill (2006).

[20] For this major paradigm shift, see particularly Goldhill (2001a); Whitmarsh (2001); cf. most recently, and with a specific focus on late antiquity, Goldhill (2020). Examples of studies on individual authors include Elsner (1992) and Hutton (2005a) on Pausanias; Smith (2014) on Aelianus. For the notion of cultural identity as constructed and performed, rather than merely factual, see Hall (1990): 226 ('not an essence but a positioning'). Subscribing to this approach to identity, throughout the book I use terms like 'Greek' and 'Roman' not as rigid and watertight categories, but as ways to identify choices of cultural self-positioning, which could overlap and certainly converged in some everyday contexts; cf. Whitmarsh (2001): 22.

process.[21] When tackling the imperial reception of lyric, either in the restricted form of quotations used or as a broader system of traditions, figures and tropes as is attempted here, what is really worth probing is what lyric added to the sense of the past of imperial Greeks, and in turn in what ways their constructions, their making sense, shaping and, to an extent, engineering of their present and/through their past determined their versions of lyric.[22]

To be sure, so far similar issues have been raised and examined concerning genres and authors at the core of imperial literary education such as Homeric epic, Hesiod, Attic drama, oratory and philosophy.[23] But in relation to imperial *paideia*, lyric poetry was no 'usual' genre: for one thing, the linguistic variety exploited by lyric subgenres such as Lesbian monody or epinician poetry required that readers make use of scholarly resources to interpret Sappho's or Pindar's poems, which were accordingly restricted to a more advanced readership. At the same time, even lyric figures and traditions surviving in parallel with or independently from textual circulation stood out against the backdrop of mainstream education underpinned by epic and Attic models, for lyric singers and performances activated a range of idiosyncratic discourses concerning ideologies of the (authorial) self, community-making and the mediation between communities and ruling power. What, for instance, were the ramifications of evoking Alcaeus' poetry on *stasis* in archaic Lesbos under the efficient and (forcefully) peaceful rule of Rome? How could the chorus still be relevant as the quintessential Greek symbol of the polity when political agency rested ultimately in the hands of a single, Roman emperor? My discussion will tackle these and similar issues in order to expose the features of and the reasons behind Aristides' (re-)construction of lyric tradition, what his poetics of lyric (in prose; cf. §0.2) looked like, and how this was meant to, or may, work in the author's imperial

[21] See e.g. Kim (2010) and Greensmith (2020) on the transformative reception of Homer in imperial prose and poetry respectively. To stress notions of construction and manipulation of tradition, whenever linguistically acceptable I have emphasised the prefix 're-' (and, less frequently, 'de-') through the hyphen; cf. Greensmith (2020).

[22] The key term here is 'reception', which I specifically use throughout the book to refer to creative and productive engagement with lyric.

[23] Besides Kim (2010) and Greensmith (2020) for Homer, see e.g. Hunter (2014) and van Noorden (2018) on Hesiod; Peterson (2019) on Old Comedy. Richter (2011) analyses how discourses of natural genealogy developed by philosophers and orators in classical Athens fed into Greek identity strategies under the Empire. Closer to the matter in hand, Hawkins (2014) has reconstructed the imperial afterlife of *iambos* as a complex literary model for a series of Greek and Roman writers in poetry and prose. Cf. Modini (2022), where I argue for the need to explore the cultural politics of lyric reception well into late antiquity.

settings.[24] Precisely because Aristides' oratory interfaced with imperial communities and their own (re-)construction of tradition, furthermore, such an analysis will also throw light on the ways in which lyric was active in the identity strategies of imperial cities. Before we can delve into Aristides' lyric reception and its significance for our understanding of his figure and works, however, it is necessary to contextualise his choice of lyric as a model in relation to rhetoric's closeness to this poetic genre.

0.2 Aristides' Choice, and the Choice of Aristides

By the imperial era, the kinship between rhetoric, especially epideictic, and lyric as genres 'of presence' underpinned by occasion had a long history and was commonly acknowledged by rhetoricians. For instance, in the first of the two treatises on epideictic rhetoric attributed to Menander Rhetor (late third or early fourth century), readers are referred to Sappho, Anacreon, Bacchylides, Simonides and Alcaeus for examples of diverse hymns to the gods ('cletic', 'apopemptic', 'genealogical' and 'fictitious' hymns addressed to personifications; pp. 333.8–23, 340.12–16 Russell–Wilson). But lyric models may also come in handy when celebrating human patrons, censuring precise targets or advising rulers: for together with Homer and Hesiod, lyric poets 'praised and blamed many people' (p. 393.8: πολλοὺς μὲν ἐνεκωμίασαν, πολλοὺς δὲ ἔψεξαν), while 'always associating with kings and tyrants and giving them the best advice' (13–14: ἀεὶ συνόντες βασιλεῦσι καὶ τυράννοις συμβουλεύοντες τὰ ἄριστα).[25] That aims and attitudes of epideictic oratory may converge with those of lyric, and that they may often entail a careful combination of praise and advice, was apparently recognised by Aristides himself among

[24] Throughout the book as well as in the book title, I use 'poetics' to foreground two interconnected phenomena, or better two aspects of the same phenomenon: the creative principles informing Aristides' literary self-construction through his engagement with lyric, as well as the poetic nature of the model, which results in tension and agonistic self-positioning on the part of the prose writer.

[25] By including Archilochean blame in the examples provided by οἱ λυρικοί (p. 393.9–12: 'nor should you neglect Archilochus, who punished his enemies very adequately in his poetry, so that you will be able to make good use of him when you want to criticise people'), Menander Rhetor apparently adopted a broader notion of 'lyric' encompassing *iambos* alongside melic poetry; still, his use of λυρικός points to specific archaic and classical poets rather than to a wider, and longer, poetic tradition, see §0.1. Unlike Menander, Paus. 1.2.3 makes a distinction between poets like Anacreon, Aeschylus and Simonides, who consorted with powerful tyrants like Polycrates of Samos and Hiero of Syracuse, and Homer and Hesiod, who instead 'either failed to win the society of kings or else purposely despised it'.