

Introduction

ADRIAN KELLY AND HENRY SPELMAN

For many classical scholars, the study of ‘intertextual’ links between the literary works of Greece and Rome is virtually synonymous with the poetry of Vergil, but it is a relatively recent development. In 1962, W. A. Camps was still of the view that ‘the reader [sc. of the *Aeneid*] unacquainted with the Homeric poems will not be at any essential disadvantage’, since that poem’s allusions to Homer ‘only rarely enhance the significance of the Virgilian context in which they appear’.¹ No scholar would today endorse that statement, though they may well feel that criticism of the poet should not begin and end with the tracing of Homeric (or, indeed, any other literary) influence. When Camps wrote, it had long been recognised that Vergil was deeply inspired by his great predecessor, but just two years later in 1964 Georg Knauer published his epochal *Die Aeneis und Homer*, in which he listed in exhaustive detail the myriad ways in which the Augustan poet expected his audience to be able to recognise Homeric allusions. Though this book sparked plenty of disagreement and doubt,² it set the direction for future debate. The appearance in 1974 of Robin Schlunk’s *The Homeric Scholia and the Aeneid*³ – arguing that Vergil was not only asking his audiences to be aware of a literary inheritance but also the scholarly, technical discourse that had grown up around it – showed how thoroughly

We are particularly grateful to Bill Allan, Felix Budelmann, and André Lardinois for their help with this introduction. All translations are ours unless otherwise stated.

¹ Camps 1962: 9. He did on the next page qualify this statement, but with reservations almost equally unacceptable today: ‘Thus an acquaintance with the Homeric poems, though not essential to the modern reader of Virgil, will bring him nearer to Virgil’s mind and to the mind of the readers for whom Virgil wrote; explaining incidentally some details which might otherwise puzzle or offend. In order to know the Homeric poems, for this purpose, it is not necessary to know Greek.’

² Knauer 1964. For disagreements, see, e.g., Pöschl 1969: 17–19; Wigodsky 1972: 8–12; cf. Hardie 1967.

³ Schlunk 1974, though his method was already clear in Schlunk 1967. See now Schmit-Neuerburg 1999.

and quickly this way of approaching ancient literature was beginning to leave its mark, especially on the study of Latin poetry.⁴

Thinking about how Greek and Roman texts relate to one another is much older than that, of course, for ‘Classicists have always been concerned with parallels’,⁵ but what was new about the movement sparked off by Knauer’s work was investigating the ways in which the proposed interaction illuminated the meaning of the text – adding to, altering, or deepening the interpretative possibilities thereby open to the audiences who shared, to varying degrees, the poet’s literary inheritance. These possibilities are of various sorts, and not only those intended by Julia Kristeva’s original sense of the word ‘intertextuality’, which for her evoked a non-intentionalist capacity of all texts to be read in the light of other texts, and which left it up to the individual reader or audience member to activate that network. In more recent analyses, the term has come to denote more author-centred, direct and deliberate forms of interaction, including allusion, *oppositio in imitando*, *imitatio cum variatione*, and so on. These avowedly intentionalist strategies have dominated the intertextual practices of classical scholarship, though some scholars have pointed to the difficulty in distinguishing, in every case, between a properly intertextual as opposed to a directly allusive interaction.⁶

No matter what the precise suppositions and aims with which the scholar approaches any given instance of interaction, ‘intertextuality’ is now used as a somewhat vague term to cover all of them simultaneously, and it has become almost the default move for scholarship on ancient Latin literature.⁷ Given the historical interdependence of Greek and Latin in the modern academy, it is no wonder that such an approach has made itself felt

⁴ To give a complete history of ‘intertextual’ studies in Latin scholarship, let alone Greek, is well beyond the scope of this introduction, but one should not fail to mention the contributions of Alessandro Barchiesi and Gian Biagio Conte (for the latter, see especially Stephen Harrison’s introduction to Conte 2007 for an excellent narrative); more general introductions in Fowler 1997 (indeed, that whole issue of *Memoriali e discussioni* is replete with landmark intertextualist discussions of a variety of texts), Hinds 1998, Edmunds 2001 and, with particular regard to Vergil, Farrell 2021: 4–27. For two recent, magisterial explorations, see Hutchinson 2013, Feeney 2016, and (for a very personal narrative), Feeney 2021: 1.5–7.

⁵ Fowler 1997: 14.

⁶ As Fowler 1997: 16–17 puts it: ‘Allusion was figured as an “extra”, a bit added to special types of text by an author who wanted to make a special point: intertextuality, on the other hand, is simply the way in which texts – all texts – mean.’ On the distinction between allusion and intertextuality, see further Morrison (Chapter 6), who stresses that intertexts change over time and between different audiences.

⁷ Consider, e.g., Hutchinson 2013, a rich collection of such investigations, but without any separate attempt to differentiate strongly between the various grades and forms of interaction.

more and more in the study of Hellenic literature in recent decades. Perhaps it was inevitable, since Hellenistic poetry was an early target for this kind of critical strategy,⁸ and strictly defined, hermetically sealed periodisations (viz. the generic terms archaic, classical, Hellenistic) are of limited utility: nothing is ever so neat as we like to pretend, and the continuities can, and should be, investigated, no less than the differences.

Indeed, interactive dynamics have long been sought and identified at every visible period in that literary history from Homer onwards. Aristophanes' quotations (and parodies and echoes etc.) of Aeschylus and Euripides in the *Frogs*, to take a famous example, reveal both an author *and* an audience at the end of the fifth century BCE attuned to direct interaction, and prepared to make much artistic and semantic fun from it.⁹ Thanks to plays like this,¹⁰ where 'Dionysus' could even be depicted reading a copy of Euripides' *Andromeda* (52–4), late fifth-century Athens was once thought of as the home of a thriving book trade (cf. Eupolis fr. 327 K–A), with a sizeable culture of written texts and readers.¹¹ We were largely disabused of this impression in the 1990s by Rosalind Thomas and William Harris, both of whom pointed out that widespread literacy of this sort was hardly possible, or at least very poorly evidenced, in the ancient world.¹² However one feels about applying their findings to the issue of literary history in later periods of antiquity, the problem is particularly acute in archaic and early classical Greece, since written texts were much rarer in this period than they were in Augustan Rome, and almost all poetry was intended for, and experienced in, live performance. There must have been a considerable practical, as well as conceptual, shift in the evolution of textuality and literacy over the long course of the intervening centuries.¹³ Most obviously, this depends on the brute fact of historical

⁸ Giangrande 1967.

⁹ See now Farmer 2017 for the whole question of comic intertextuality. For discussion within this volume of specifically dramatic intertextualities, see the contributions of Wright (Chapter 7), Coe (Chapter 8), and Hunter and Lämmle (Chapter 9).

¹⁰ Consider, e.g., the fragment from Euripides' *Theseus* where a rustic character describes in somewhat naïve manner the shape of letters (fr. 382 K; cf. also Agathon fr. 4 *TRGF*), or the *Alphabet Tragedy* of Callias (T *7 *PCG*) with its laboured jokes about letter types and appearances: see Rosen 1999, Gagné 2013.

¹¹ See, e.g., Harvey 1966, and the superb discussion in Ford 2003.

¹² Harris 1989: 45–115; Thomas 1992; also Spelman 2019; cf. *contra* Missiou 2011.

¹³ As Reynolds and Wilson 1991: 1 put it, with regard to epic poetry in the archaic period, though the point can be extended: 'The habit of reading . . . instead of hearing . . . can hardly have been created overnight, and books remained something of a rarity until well into the fifth century.' See also Ford 2003: 19: 'The evidence will suggest that songs were increasingly textualized in the period from Simonides to Plato; this is not to say that songs were being written down with

change, namely an increase in the number of written texts as physical artefacts. Such developments also brought with them changes in the way works are conceptualised and an ambition to exploit the attendant possibilities for producing meaning.¹⁴ It is hard to believe, for example, that a reader, let alone an artist, equipped to make the kinds of links which Damien Nelis suggests in his study of Apollonian influence on Vergil could have done so, at least to the extent and detail argued, without constant and easy recourse to a written text of the *Argonautica*.¹⁵ And no-one is suggesting that this kind of interaction was feasible in the archaic period. Everyone agrees that historical and conceptual changes took place, while crucial questions remain about their nature, chronology, and consequences.

But perhaps questions of limited literacy and the availability of written texts matter less to an early interactive investigation than one might think. Even though his first audiences did not generally possess physical copies of Euripides' tragedies, for example, Aristophanes clearly expected at least some people to recognise the source of the quotations that he gives and distorts.¹⁶ Reference to, or invocation of, a 'text' was felt possible and meaningful even when few people had access to actual copies of them. Textualization, in other words, does not track precisely with reified texts. Presumably this was so, at least in part, because the dramatic festivals of Athens afforded some stability in terms of audiences and artists: Aristophanes could rely on some of those watching his plays to have attended at least some of Euripides' productions; even if no-one or very

greater frequency in this period, but that their transcriptions were being put to new uses – as works of art to be enjoyed in private reading and not as scripts or promptbooks to be memorized for performance and reused in social contexts. Allowing that our evidence is slim, I shall argue that it is significant that only very late in the fifth century do we find songs being approached, studied, and enjoyed in the form of texts – fixed and isolated verbal constructs demanding a special form of appreciation and analysis.'

¹⁴ See esp. the discussion of Ford 2003: 18–19.

¹⁵ Nelis 2001. As ever, even here there are precedents: see Clausen 1987, thoroughly updated and expanded in Clausen 2002. Another important difference between the early Greek and Roman situations is the self-consciously 'literary' and 'bookish' nature of Latin intertextuality (see esp. Parker 2009), which defines the way in which Roman literature appropriates the more openly performative aesthetic of archaic and classical Greek literature. For typically insightful comments on the disciplinary differences at work here, and their increasing coalescence, see Feeney 2021: 1.5–14.

¹⁶ For an excellent examination of the varied levels of audience knowledge, experience, competence, and literacy, see Revermann 2006.

few people in the audience would appreciate every reference, then at least most people in the audience would get some of them.¹⁷

In the archaic period, by contrast, we have much less certainty about performance or reperformance contexts and audience stability (with regard both to the wider stories and to the more precise versions of those stories), or how those factors relate to the written artefact.¹⁸ But this has not prevented scholars from seeking links between the literary texts that have survived. Sometimes this analysis was conducted within the once fashionable notion of an ‘epic’ age succeeded by a ‘lyric’ age, representing an advance in the social, political, or literary tastes of the Greeks.¹⁹ The method encouraged – indeed, depended upon – an impression of direct interactions with the Homeric texts. Consider, for example, Archilochus fr. 114 *IEG*² (text and [slightly modified] translation from Swift 2019):

οὐ φιλ<έω> μέγαν στρατηγὸν οὐδὲ διαπεπλιγμένον
 οὐδὲ βοοστρύχοισι γαῦρον οὐδ’ ὑπεξυρημένον,
 ἀλλὰ μοι σμικρὸς τις εἴη καὶ περὶ κνήμας ἰδεῖν
 ροϊκός, ἀσφαλ<έω>ς βεβηκῶς ποσσὶ, καρδίας πλέως.

I don’t care for a general who is tall and takes a long stride,
 proud of his curls and partly shaven.
 No, for me let him be short and bandy-legged to look at
 round the shins, standing firm on his feet, full of heart.

There is no particular phraseological link with Homer, but its memorably practical portrait was once (and sometimes still is) considered to be aimed specifically at the ‘grand old general’ in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, a figure to be contrasted with the ethics and concerns of a newer age.²⁰ The conclusion is

¹⁷ See Wright (Chapter 7) on tragic reperformance. A particular case is the reperformance of *Frogs* a year later in 403 BCE, an example of what Joanna Hanink calls ‘strong reperformance’, where members of the audience have experienced the earlier play itself (Hanink 2017: 37–9, though she applies it to a different, somewhat more temporally removed example). This phenomenon can be related to Bruno Currie’s very useful but still different notion of ‘rubbing shoulders’ as a criterion for thinking about literary relationships, viz. that performances of poems in the same genre at the same or similar places would provide the kind of stability required for an interactive dynamic; see Currie 2021, though he puzzlingly denies Morrison’s (Chapter 6) congruent thesis of Pindaric self-reference.

¹⁸ See Scodel 2021 for some typically excellent discussion of the different ways in which different kinds of performances can relate to the written history of the artefact.

¹⁹ For the original statement of this ‘Geistesgeschichte’, see Snell 1946, with subsequent editions in 1948 (translated into English in 1953 by Thomas Rosenmeyer), 1955 and 1975. Its impact was great, to judge from such central works as Fränkel 1951 and Treu 1968: see Burkert 2004 for a more critical review.

²⁰ See Russo 1974 for a thorough debunking of this kind of reading. The relationship between the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* is also often configured in this way: see, e.g., Heubeck, West, and

crude to the point of being crass (think merely of someone like Odysseus, for instance, who is both short and, for much of the *Odyssey*, bald).²¹ This kind of interpretation, moreover, depends upon simplistic notions of progression, where one text, held to be emblematic of a culture or period, is then directly and consciously replaced by another, emblematic of a different culture or period; yet to do so in this case is not only predicated on the questionable basis of finding kinds of direct interaction familiar from later periods of antiquity, but also avoids thinking about the tremendous variety of the *basileis* in Homer, as well as characters of the same or similar status in the rest of early Greek *epos*, almost all of which, of course, has vanished.²²

Other, better arguments for early poetic interaction relied less on cultural history and more strongly on points of similarity in diction or event, as with Alcaeus' 'summary' of the *Iliad* (fr. 44 Voigt),²³ his 'invocations' of apparently Homeric arming scenes (fr. 140.3–5 Voigt),²⁴ or his 'quotation' (fr. 347 Voigt) of Hesiod's *Works and Days* (582–96) (a case to which we will return).²⁵ Interactions like these were frequently used principally as evidence for the textual emergence and spread of early *epos*,²⁶ but – even if we choose to link the texts in these cases, which is not the only option available – it is far from clear that this kind of reference *has* to depend on the widespread possession of written texts (whether by the audience or the performer), rather than the currency of well-known or 'marquee' episodes or themes. The audience's memory and recall of such material might be more easily imagined independently of any written, fixed, textual form (though that might, of course, lie in the background of any performance[s] giving rise to that memory).

The importance of these uncertainties is particularly acute in the case of elegy, which shares the traditional rhythms and diction of *epos*, and so

Hainsworth 1988: 351: 'Achilles was the last and greatest of those heroes who solved their problems by excess of violence; Odysseus represents a newer idea . . . probably congenial to many in the Homeric audience, the cool opportunist, valiant but prudent, and not ashamed to stoop to conquer.'

²¹ See Hedreen 2016: 80–1, reviewing previous arguments and Homeric identifications.

²² See esp. Swift 2019: 18–19, and esp. 295–6, who is well aware that the Homeric poems already explore the tension between appearance and reality foregrounded in this fragment.

²³ See Kelly 2015c (sceptical), with reference to further literature.

²⁴ Though it is not clear to which Homeric arming scene (*Il.* 3.336–7 = 11.41–42 = 16.137–8 = 15.480–1) the poet is meant to be referring. See Page 1955b: 209–23; Rösler 1980: 153–4; Kelly 2015c: 27–8; Spelman 2015, Budelmann 2018: 106–10.

²⁵ In favour of Hesiodic allusion or dependence, see e.g. West 2012: 209; against, Petropoulos 1994; Kelly 2022a: 36–7.

²⁶ West 2002: 208–9 (= 2011–13: I.394–5); West 2012: 228–9.

raises the stakes of textuality even more clearly than some of the other poetry from this period (as the next section will explore in more detail). To some scholars, for example, it has seemed almost inevitable directly to connect Mimnermus' words (fr. 2.1–5 *IEG*²⁷) on the transitory nature of human life with several Homeric expressions of this theme (*Il.* 2.467–8, 800–1, 6.145–50, 21.462–7, *Od.* 7.105–6, *Od.* 9.47–50).²⁷ Yet consensus about what we should do with this and other examples has proved more than elusive: are they to be considered traditional and common themes (= intertextual in the Kristevan sense), or pointed and particular (= allusions, intended by the poet)? The evidence, and the state of our knowledge about audiences and performance situations, does not allow us to be sure. The question then becomes 'what can we do without this certainty?' Is there a way to interpret these poems which does not rely on an unproveable postulate, or do we just have to lump for the most defensible position and proceed from there?

We also need to be explicit about how much of the interpretative burden these textual interactions can or should bear. What, for instance, is at stake in the case of Alcaeus fr. 347 Voigt and its relationship to Hesiod's *Works and Days*? The exuberance of its abrupt, opening exhortation to 'drench your lungs in wine' (τέγγε πλεύμονα οἴνωι) is clear without any interaction, and the language of the poem is sufficiently redolent of 'wisdom literature' (e.g. in the way it describes a season and links it with an appropriate instruction) that an audience can grasp the effect of its faux wisdom all too well. Such an interpretation can be allied to, or at least becomes more articulated with, a direct Hesiodic allusion, so perhaps we should not be looking for an either/or approach, but one which combines the possibilities: some members of the audience, that is, may use Alcaeus' 'playful reappropriation'²⁸ of Hesiod's more restrained picture to contrast and deepen their impression of the more vivacious singer and his exhortations, whilst others deploy their knowledge of paraenetic poetry (whether or not the particular theme is a conventional one, as Petropoulos argues)²⁹ to reach virtually the same interpretative conclusion – the enthusiasm and content of the opening invocation colours the traditional stance of the moralising poet as the poem proceeds. These are not, indeed cannot be,

²⁷ Compare especially the treatments of Griffith 1975 with Burgess 2001: 117–26; see also Kelly 2015c: 22–4.

²⁸ Budelmann 2018: 110. The whole of his reading is very similar to the one advanced here, combining traditional with allusive reference, but without seeing them as opposed or preclusive; cf. Spelman 2022: 277–8.

²⁹ Petropoulos 1994.

mutually preclusive groups, either: anyone in the audience who knows Hesiod's song also knows many other traditional forms in which the various shared elements of the poems are to be found. Given our uncertainties about the 'literary' culture of the archaic period, allusive and traditional perspectives have to be combined, especially when their interpretative payoff is so congruent.³⁰

A suggestive parallel for all these questions, in several respects, can be found in the study of 'heroic' scenes in archaic art. Largely concerned to trace the influence of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* on artistic discourse so as to fill out a picture of literary history, much scholarly effort once subordinated entirely the visual mythos of the potters and painters to the oral/aural mythos of the poets.³¹ This resulted in a predictable stand-off between those who saw an early and pervasive Homeric influence and those who denied it.³² The arguments mirror in several ways those for and against literary allusions – are the details close enough (and how would we define that anyway?), are there significant differences between them, is this a generic scene, etc. – whilst adding some more particular considerations – are they so-called *Sagenbilder* or *Lebensbilder* (and is this old distinction defensible?), etc. As one example, consider the series of fourteen Geometric images, on a variety of artefacts, depicting characters who look like conjoined twins (*LIMC* 1/1, 472–6). These are usually linked to Eurytus and Cteatus, twin sons of Molione and Poseidon/Actor, known by parental epithets as the 'Molione' and/or 'Aktorione'. They have a few, passing references in the *Iliad* (2.621, 11.709, 750, 23.638), some of which imply that they were physically unusual, though that is explicitly said for the first time in the *Catalogue of Women* (Hes. fr. 17, 18 M–W). Some scholars hold not only that the images in question are illustrations of these 'Aktorione Molione' but specifically those figures from the *Iliad*;³³ some accept the identification but think that we have not an illustration of the *Iliad* but rather a reflection of some other epic poem or tradition;³⁴ still others even deny the very identification.³⁵ However our sparse textual evidence is to be factored in here, it is obvious that the twins have a wider mythological footprint; as several chapters in this

³⁰ For an attempt to do this with Sappho, see Kelly 2020.

³¹ Take, as exemplary of this kind of scholarship, Kannicht 1982, which opens with an apology for its originally (and largely) philological concerns.

³² Of the former, see e.g. Friis Johansen 1967, Schefold 1964 (= 1966), Ahlberg-Cornell 1992. Of the latter, e.g., Cook 1983, Snodgrass 1997, 1998.

³³ Ahlberg-Cornell 1992: 32–3, 39–40, 62–3.

³⁴ Friis Johansen 1967: 23–7; Snodgrass 1998: 26–33.

³⁵ Boardman 1983: 25–6; Powell 1997: 192; *contra* Coldstream 1991: 51–2.

book point out, we have to acknowledge that a figure's appearance in one artefact does not demand the artist's familiarity with the same figure's appearance in any other extant artefact. Somehow we have to interpret the image – and our literary texts – without this kind of certainty.

One also wonders at the troubling hierarchical dominance of literature in these investigations, where the visual evidence is simply a Homeric footnote, only of interest insofar as it can cast light on literary history. The pendulum has largely swung in favour of those we might think of as separatists on this matter, scholars who rejoice that the appreciation of early Greek visual art has been 'released from the shadow of Homer',³⁶ though voices to the opposite effect are still heard.³⁷ In general, the study of vases is now being conducted on its own terms, with the visual discourse treated as an independent, parallel, or at least a self-sufficient, object of study.³⁸ Where interaction with a mythological or poetic background is posited, that can be flexible and multi-directional, acknowledging the complexity of a situation for which good evidence is lacking, whilst the integrity of the artistic tradition is respected and evaluated on its own terms. Thus, some of the new directions in the contributions to this volume run in parallel with the history of, and developments in, the scholarship on archaic visual art.

Where do we go from here? Well before – and ever since – Robert Fowler reviewed all of the early 'quotations' of Homer and found that 'there are no Virgils here',³⁹ sceptical and enthusiastic voices have continued to be heard on both sides, and there seems little prospect of immediate consensus. Nonetheless, now is a good opportunity to reconsider the material and its interpretation, precisely because more and more scholars are deploying

³⁶ Langdon 2008: 4.

³⁷ See, e.g., Osborne (Chapter 11), and Osborne 2018a, who explains the relative absence of Homeric scenes on art by reference to the different interests of painters and poets. In a more traditional attempt to link the two, Hurwit 2011 sees the possibility that a reference intended may be to more general stories of Odysseus rather than the one enshrined for us in the *Odyssey*, and suggests a sliding scale of 'strong' and 'weak' identifications with a mythical narrative.

³⁸ For a brief summary, see Langdon 2008: 1–16, and the more recent introduction to Barringer and Lissarrague 2021 (the essays in that volume – almost a *Doppelgänger* to the current project – are an excellent sampling of these new directions). For other, somewhat earlier, examples, see e.g. Lowenstam 1992, 1997, 2008, and the influential work of Giuliani 2003 (= 2013), who argues generally that differences between text and art are to be seen as the latter's creative engagement with and reconfiguration of the story. Hedreen 2016 reads literary and visual evidence side by side and give equal attention to each as complementary illustrations (though his treatment of the literary evidence *per se* is somewhat more traditionally intertextual).

³⁹ Fowler 1987: 39. For scepticism, see Kelly 2015c; for particularly good examples of enthusiasm, see Swift 2019: 18–22 (on Archilochus' reception of Homer) and Swift, Chapter 2 (on Archilochus' reception of Hesiod).

an intertextual apparatus – in whatever form – for the exploration of early Greek literary history. As we increasingly agree on the need to read early Greek literature in a comparative way, this only makes more urgent the question of how best to do so. The current volume responds to this growing trend in criticism, and represents an attempt to bring together the voices of different scholars on the current *status quaestionis*, to explore the layout of the field, and to point the way forward by reframing the older questions and asking some new ones.

Problems and Possibilities

This section highlights some of the core concerns of this book by exploring in chronological order two contrastive and complementary case studies from early elegy, one from Tyrtaeus and one from Simonides. Both belong to a genre which is mentioned at several points in, but is not the sole focus of, any of the following chapters.⁴⁰ Several chapters do, however, bring out the intertextual dynamics particular to various genres,⁴¹ and elegy also offers its own unique case. The dactylic rhythm of the elegiac couplet, one half of which is a dactylic hexameter, encodes a relationship with epic into its basic formal structure.⁴² The recurrent challenge is understanding the precise nature of that relationship. Consider, for example, the reflection on the ‘beautiful death’ theme in Homer (*Il.* 22.71–6) and Tyrtaeus (fr. 10.21–30 *IEG*²):

νέωι δέ τε πάντ' ἐπέοικεν
 ἄρῃι κταμένωι δεδαῖγμένωι ὄξεϊ χαλκῶι
 κείσθαι· πάντα δὲ καλὰ θανόντι περ ὅττι φανήη·
 ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ πολίων τε κάρη πολίων τε γένειον
 αἰδῶ τ' αἰσχύνωσι κύνες κταμένοιο γέροντος,
 τοῦτο δὴ οἴκτιστον πέλεται δειλοῖσι βροτοῖσιν.

For a young man it is completely fitting
 to lie dead, killed in war and pierced by sharp
 bronze. Though he is dead, everything, whatever appears, is beautiful.
 But when dogs disfigure the grey head and grey beard
 and genitals of an old man who has been killed,
 this is a most pitiable thing for wretched mortals.

⁴⁰ But see Swift (Chapter 2) on Archilochus and Thomas (Chapter 3) on inscriptions. Spelman (Chapter 5) discusses Simonides' 'Plataea Elegy' in a different light.

⁴¹ See, for example, Coe (Chapter 8) as well as Hunter and Laemmle (Chapter 9) on satyr drama.

⁴² Cf. Kelly 2022: 34, 36.