Species of Ambiguity in Semonides Fr. 7

Anderson, D.

Species of Ambiguity in Semonides fr. 7

Abstract

This paper looks at the structure of Semonides' catalogue in fragment seven, and at the metaphors that underpin it. There is a tension between the organising function of this catalogue and the hybrid entities it lists. It is suggested that the opening and closing lines frame the catalogue conceptually, exploiting ambiguities in the words χωρίς, γένος, and φῦλον. Not only does Semonides play with ideas of order and embrace ambiguities of language, but he suggests that these are a feature of his poetic inheritance: the female types of his catalogue are a collection of hybrids assembled from a variety of Archaic texts and traditions.

Introduction

Our longest surviving fragment of Archaic iambic poetry, Semonides' *Female Types* or *Tirade Against Women* (fr. 7),[1] is well known for the extensive catalogue which takes up its first half. However, the structure and nature of this catalogue, which is strikingly different from other examples of archaic lists,[2] has never been individually treated and deserves fuller attention. Most notably, there

---

1   'Female types' is Hubbard's expression (1994: 181), who does not however employ it as a title. 'Tirade against women' has long been used in English to refer to an abusive speech against women in general (e.g. MacCabe 1849: 87), and has been the most common way to refer to Semonides' poem in the scholarship (e.g. Sinclair 1932: xxxii), ultimately going back to Stobaeus' own chapter heading περὶ γάμου· ψόγος γυναικῶν (Stob. IV 22.193 = Wachsmuth-Hense 1884-1912: IV 561-6). περὶ γυναικῶν (Kiessling 1864: 136) meaning *On Women* (Keuls 1993²: 231) or *On Wives* (Stehle 1997: 237) has also been used as an informal title, as has *Weiberiambos* (Verdenius 1968: 132) or *Iamb on Women* (Bettini 2013: 161). Note too Ribbeck's fanciful *Frauenspiegel* (1865: 74), followed by von Sybel (1873: 327) and Schmidt (1882: I 50), and Opitz' *Weiberspiegel* (1891). A list of editions can be found at Pellizer-Tedeschi 1990: lix-lxiii; the poem is cited in this paper from West 1989-92²: II 99-106. Commentary is found at Koeler 1781, Müller 1831, Welcker 1835: 51-74, Marg 1938: 6-34, Wilhelm 1949, Verdenius 1968, 1969, Gerber 1970: 57-64, West 1974: 177-9, Lloyd-Jones 1975: 63-92, North 1977: 36-7, 45, Verdenius 1977, Campbell 1982²: 187-91, Pellizer-Tedeschi 1990: 119-55. Significant discussions include Marg 1938: 35-42, Radermacher 1947: 156-72, Fraenkel 1975: 200-7, Lloyd-Jones 1975: 22-33, Loraux 1978: 75-117, Schear 1984, Easterling 1985, Hubbard 1994, Stehle 1997: 237-9, Osborne 2001, 2005, Morgan 2005.

2   Semonides' list is parasitic on Archaic genealogies and enumerations of gifts, for which see the section entitled

is a tension throughout between the ordering function of the catalogue and the lack of order implied within each of its entries, which present a series of hybrids. The catalogue's structure reflects this tension: entries are organized using a feminine pronoun which inconsistently resolves into either component of each woman-animal-element compound. Deleuze-Guattari's notion of becoming-animal offers a paradigm to help explain these examples of heterogeneous composition. In addition, two semi-explicit ancient conceptualizations of hybridity appear within the poem, framing the catalogue. First, its introductory sentence associates variety with otherness through the ambiguous syntax of the adverb χωρίς. This association is upheld throughout the catalogue in references to filth, taken broadly as that which confuses internal and external (ingestion, excrement, intercourse). Second, ideas of material constitution, generation, and genealogy are used to define the connection of woman to animal and elemental through the terms γένος and φῦλον, the latter of which rounds off the catalogue in a telescoping analogy. Thus, while the aim of the poem appears more or less straightforwardly misogynistic, eliciting humour at the expense of women and reinforcing patriarchal mores,[3] the operation of the catalogue is more complex, using a variety of models to help articulate the idea of an irreducible but heterogeneous composite. Although catalogues and lists typically provide structure, reduce clutter, and help establish order out of disorder, Semonides' catalogue is less about sorting the types of women within it as it is evoking female hybridity, permability, instability, impurity.

Item and list (τὴν δέ)

Semonides' catalogue proposes that the minds of women, specifically married women, are akin to those of animals, or to natural elements. Although this premise is simple-minded, its execution is

---

'Generation, heredity, inheritance (γένος, φῦλον)' below. The terms 'catalogue' and 'list' are used interchangeably in this paper in reference to Semonides' enumeration of female types. 'List' is the more common and generic term; 'catalogue' suggests greater weight and expansiveness, either of the enumeration as a whole, or of individual items within it (cf. Minchin 2001: 73-6).

3   The moral function of the poem and its connection to other wisdom literature is discussed by Morgan (2005). The obvious misogyny of the poem is worth noting because it has sometimes been played down in the scholarship, e.g. Payne 2010: 112, 'This is not a personal narrative: there is no indication that its author has been wounded by his subjects and has hostile intentions toward them as a result'.

elaborate, drawing on a range of conceptual and linguistic ambiguities. Most notably, the individual figures of the catalogue are not so much 'analogies' (North 1977: 36) or 'trope[s]' (Osborne 2001: 47) as they are composites in which the human and animal parts can only ever be imperfectly distinguished. What appear on the surface to be metaphorical connections between female personality types and species of animal or natural phenomena, grow unclear as the intersections between tenor and vehicle change from one entry to the next.[4] Although the repeated use of the word γυνή might appear a persistent reminder that women are the object of abuse (ll. 1, 8, 23, 41, 67, 73, 88, 90, 92, cf. 97, 100, 106, 113, 118), there is a slide throughout the poem between the conceit that the behaviour (1 νόον) of women is akin to that of animals and material elements, and that the women are themselves constituted out of those same animals and elements. Indeed, the word γυνή may at some points remain ambiguous, since it can mean not only 'woman' or 'wife', but also simply a 'female' when used in reference to an animal (*LSJ* IV). Even taking the word at face value, moreover, the need for such a continual reminder of the human component would point to the sustained confusion of human and inhuman throughout the catalogue. One explanatory simile appears at first glance to imply that the sea-woman can be explained in terms of an analogy between woman and sea (37-40).[5] However, Semonides' own interpretation of this simile, provided at its close, reveals the specific point of interaction to be a pecularity of this female type: 41-2 ταύτῃ μάλιστ' ἔοικε τοιαύτη γυνή | ὀργήν· φυὴν δὲ πόντος ἀλλοίην ἔχει *such a woman appears very much like this in temperament, but the sea has a different bodily form*.[6] This woman alone does not

---

4   Marg 1938: 9, 'Der Kunstgriff des Dichters besteht darin, dass nicht zuerst das Tier gezeichnet und dann die entsprechende Weiberart verglichen wird, sondern dass beides in eins zusammengezogen ist'.

5   A second explanatory simile is found in the entry on the monkey-woman: 78-9, δήνεα δε πάντα καὶ τρόπους ἐπίσταται | ὥσπερ πίθηκος. This simile identifies the first monkey-like behaviour of this type, following the decription of various physical attributes. As in the entry on the sea-woman, the use of a simile appears to articulate a distinction between mental and physical points of relation.

6   The meaning of line forty-two has been contested. If it is meant to interpret the simile, it should mean 'for the sea has a variable nature' (Renehan 1983: 11-2). However, the ellipse of ἄλλοτε disallows this interpretation (Lloyd-Jones 1975: 72–73, Pellizer-Tedeschi 1990: 129–30). Furthermore, while φυή is found with the sense 'inherent nature' at Archil. fr. 25.1 ἀνθρώπου φυή, this meaning would be awkward here because of the juxtaposition of the words ὀργήν and φυήν, which would need to have the same meaning. It seems more likely that φυή means 'bodily form', as

share her physical form with animal or element. The implication is that, for all other entries, the exchange of mental and physical features is not so clear cut.

The assemblages in Semonides' catalogue are indicated by means of a syntactically obscure pronoun: τὴν μέν … τὴν δέ … . The feminine pronoun in the accusative indistinctly stands for either γυναῖκα, the female animal, or the feminine element in each case.[7] The figures of Semonides' catalogue are deprived of nouns in favour of pronominal placeholders; what is more, they are deprived of the agency of a nominative. Such insistent use of the accusative is by no means necessary. We may contrast the catalogue of deaths in Semonides fr. 1, a catalogue which also uses generalizing pronouns, but in alternation between nominative and accusative plural: 7-8 οἳ μέν … οἳ δέ … , 12-13 τοὺς δέ … τοὺς δ' … . Moreover, this pronoun is a grammatical other, a direct object whose immobility from first position and immutability from the accusative singular are apparent in the variety of formula used to sustain it: 7 τὴν δ' θεὸς ἔθηκ[ε] *one a god made*, 21-2 τὴν δὲ πλάσαντες Ὀλύμπιοι ἔδωκαν *the Olympians having fashioned another, gave her [to the world]*, 50 τὴν δ' ἐκ γαλῆς γένος *another is of the race of the weasel*, 57 τὴν δ' ἵππος ἐγείνατο *a horse gave birth to another*; at one instance the formula is even retained with a distinctly separate meaning: 28 τὴν μέν … ἡμέρην *another … day*. It is not clear that any one of these sentences is implied when no introductory formula is found at all, as is the case for most of the entries, including the first (2, 12, 27, 43, 71, 83).

The absence of syntax in lists is a reflex of the containment and organization of miscellaneous items. Words regularly revert within lists to an extra-grammatical, default case — one which is morphologically coded as nominative, or less commonly accusative, and is understood outside any syntactical relation.[8] By a process of association, the list seems to accumulate actual things through its

---

in Homer (*LSJ* φυή I 2), so that the final line draws a contrast between mental disposition and physical shape.

7   Campbell 1982[2]: 187, 'ὑός: "sow", since all the [animal] parents listed by Semon[ides] are either feminine or common, presumed feminine'. Both elements γῆ (> 21 γήινος) and θάλασσα (27) are also feminine.

8   Havers (1927) provides a thorough treatment of this use of the nominative; see in particular pages 98-103 on lists, e.g. 102, 'Der Nom[inativ] wird aber nicht nur gewählt, weil der häufigste und daher der bequemste Kasus ist, sondern auch, weil er am meisten geeignet ist, die Vertretung der kasuslosen Form zu übernehmen'. Thorp (1989) provides a clear historiographical survey from Aristotle to the present. He finds the origin of the notion of extra-syntactic nominatives at Arist. *An. pr.* I 36, 48b40 (τὰς κλήσεις τῶν ὀνομάτων), where he suggests that the names

capacity to accommodate extra-syntactic forms, so that the words contained in such a list come to stand more directly for the things they name as objects. As Christopher Johnson notes, 'to enumerate paratactically tends to conceptually and empirically conflate words and things' (2012: 1104). In Semonides' list, the repeated use of the same pronoun locates the hybrids within the text and gives them a definite, object-like quality. We might contrast Semonides' definite pronoun against the Hesiodic catalogue's indefinite motif ἢ οἵαι (*or such a one as…*). The definite although unspecified point of reference of the accusative feminine pronoun τὴν δέ perfectly delineates the compound female figures for which it stands.

A passage towards the end of the poem appears to confirm this reading of the catalogue's pronouns as purposefully ambiguous markers of the entities to which they refer, lines 110-4:

> κεχηνότος γὰρ ἀνδρός, οἱ δὲ γείτονες
>
> χαίρουσ' ὁρῶντες καὶ τόν, ὡς ἁμαρτάνει.
>
> τὴν ἣν δ' ἕκαστος αἰνέσει μεμνημένος
>
> γυναῖκα, τὴν δὲ τούτέρου μωμήσεται.
>
> For while the husband stands gaping, the
>
> neighbours take pleasure in watching how he too
>
> goes wrong. Each one will remember to praise his

---

of words are distinct from the syntactic use of the nominative within a sentence: '…one of the cases is identical in form to the name of the noun. It is as though words have both a parade dress and a series of battle dresses for different activities, and one of the battle dresses is identical in form to the parade dress' (328-9). This peculiarity of usage is upheld in modern grammars, e.g. Kühner-Gerth 1898-1904³: II 45, 'Da der Nominativ als Subjektskasus, einen Gegenstand als unabhängig bezeichnet, so gebrauchen ihn die Griechen gern bei Anführung eines Wortes, besonders eines Namens … Auf ähnliche Weise wird bei Anführungen von Gegenständen der Nominativ ohne Rücksicht auf die vorangehende Konstruktion gebraucht, *da es sich hier um die einzelnen Wörter an sich handelt* [my emphasis]'. Slings understands accusatives in anacoluthons to be examples of absolute constructions rather than stylistic effects (1992: 106⁴⁹, 1997: 198-200): his key example is Pl. *Ti.* 37E1-3. One sometimes finds extrasyntactic nominative and accusative combined in ancient lists, e.g. *P. Tebt.* 118, a receipt for wine purchased for a social club, which begins by identifying attendees: εἰσὶν ἄνδρες κβ, (τούτων) σύνδει(πνοι) ιη, ξένους δ, ὧν κτλ. *there were 22 men, 18 (of them) mem(bers), 4 guests, of whom etc.* The guests are less emotively close to the speaker, and as a consequence they are referred to using an extrasyntactic accusative in place of the nominative already used to refer to club members.

own wife, but he will fault that of another.

As Robin Osborne has pointed out, these lines make clear that the poem's speaker has the perspective of a neighbour (2005: 23), and this self-positioning is affirmed through the use of pronouns. The oblivious husband is referred to in the first couplet using an accusative masculine pronoun that recalls its feminine equivalent in the catalogue: adverbial καί not only refers to the inevitable failure of male self-awareness, but also adds the husband (τόν) to the rota of wives whom the poem's neighbourly voice has been upbraiding. Indeed, the second couplet recalls the structure of the catalogue by offering the feminine article, as often, at line-beginning (τῆν ἥν δ'), and repeats the pronoun again in the following line (τὴν δέ). The first of these uses of τήν appears to float syntactically before its combination with γυναῖκα renders what could have been a relative pronoun (ἥν) into a possessive (τὴν ἥν … γυναῖκα).[9] Moreover, the transposition of γυναῖκα might lead us to construe this word together with the seemingly redundant μεμνημένος, focalized through the husband, for whom his wife is decidedly not animal or elemental: *each man will praise his own one, mindful of her as a woman*. The subsequent use of the article (τὴν δὲ τούτέρου) then reaffirms the primary focalizer, the poem's speaker, for whom the constituent elements of each compound remain indistinct.

The flitting back and forth between the human and inhuman aspects of the list's caricatures is typical: these are not harmonious blends, but hybrid creatures, part woman and part not. Although Deleuze and Guattari themselves reject 'hybridity' as a true form of becoming-animal, that concept provides a useful model for thinking about Semonides' catalogue. In particular, becoming-animal helpfully describes 1) a state of emergence or 'intensity' that obtains between human and animal and

---

9   We find the same combination in Homer, where, however, the pronoun is a relative, not a possessive: *Od.* 21.28-9 τράπεζαν, | τὴν ἥν οἱ παρέθηκεν. Most of the Homeric instances of this possessive pronoun are found alongside the nouns they qualify (examples at Campbell 1982[2]: 191).

is not reducible to either,[10] 2) the necessity of a collective or 'animal pack',[11] and 3) becoming-other itself, which includes becoming-woman and becoming-elemental.[12] In other words, as with all 'becomings', the items in this list are instances of assemblage or more properly *agencement*, which is to say bodies entering a state of heterogeneous composition.[13] As opposed to Homeric animal similes, which tend to interact analogically along one dimension,[14] the entities in Semonides' list are made up of a variety of intersections between human, animal, and elemental. The precise relationship between parts changes, but in all cases unmatched pieces are drawn into relation.

The list is the site of this interaction for both Semonides and Deleuze-Guattari. Deleuze-Guattari make regular use of lists to emphasize the multiplicity involved in a becoming, as when they provide examples of 'blocks of becoming' whose parts are linked by contagion: 'for example a man, an animal and a bacteria, a virus, a molecule, a micro-organism. Or, in the case of the truffle, a tree, a fly, and a pig'.[15] By contrast, Semonides' list strongly articulates its individual items, using the definite pronoun. The rigid structure of Semonides' list makes for clear-cut divisions between entries

10 Deleuze-Guattari 1980: 291, 'Les devenirs-animaux ne sont pas des rêves ni des fantasmes. Ils sont parfaitement réels. Mais de quelle réalité s'agit-il? Car si devenir animal ne consiste pas à faire l'animal ou à l'imiter, il est évident aussi que l'homme ne devient pas « réellement » animal, pas plus que l'animal ne devient pas « réellement » autre chose. Le devenir ne produit pas autre chose que lui-même. C'est une fausse alternative qui nous fait dire : ou bien l'on imite, ou bien on est. Ce qui est réel, c'est le devenir lui-même, le bloc de devenir, et non pas des termes supposés fixes dans lesquels passerait celui qui devient'.

11 Deleuze-Guattari 1980: 292, 'Dans un devenir-animal, on a toujours affaire à une meute, à une bande, à une population, à un peuplement, bref à une multiplicité'.

12 Deleuze-Guattari 1980: 304, 'Il ne faut pas attacher aux devenirs-animaux une importance exclusive. Ce seraient plutôt des segments occupant une région médiane. En deçà, l'on rencontre des devenirs-femme, des devenirs-enfant (peut-être le devenir-femme possède sur tous les autres un pouvoir introductif particulier, et c'est moins la femme qui est sorcière, que la sorcellerie, qui passe par ce devenir-femme). Au-delà encore, on trouve des devenirs-élémentaires, cellulaires, moléculaires, et même des devenirs-imperceptibles'.

13 For the difference between the French original *agencement* and its standard English translation 'assemblage', see Neil 2017: 22-4.

14 The animal similes in Homer have traditionally been understood to reveal a 'constancy of disposition' (Snell 1953: 201), whereby a given animal always indicates the same emotion or behaviour.

15 Deleuze-Guattari 1980: 295, 'par exemple un homme, un animal et une bactérie, un virus, une molécule, un micro-organisme. Ou, comme pour la truffe, un arbre, une mouche et un cochon'.

and suggests a corresponding lack of distinction between components within entries. The block of becoming is a list in Deleuze-Guattari but an item in Semonides. Everything within Semonides' entries is mixed together, including not only woman, animal, and elemental parts, but also the husbands and neighbours for whom it is ultimately a becoming-woman-becoming-animal that is at stake in the poem.[16]

This reading of the catalogue in terms of Deleuze and Guattari's notion of becoming helps account for the flexibility with which each entry is constructed. Although the catalogue is organized by the feminine pronoun, entries regularly locate her within an environment, typically a house or home (3 ἀν᾽ οἶκον, 29 ἐν δόμοις, 46 ἐν μυχῷ, 47 ἐπ' ἐσχάρῃ, 60 ἐξ οἴκου, 102 συνοικητῆρα, 104 κατ' οἶκον). If itemization is a linguistic equivalent of putting what is other into a box or cage, the house represents this idea of containment within the narrative world of the poem. Taken as a whole, the catalogue becomes the description of a town (74 δι' ἄστεος). Moreover, a territory, for Deleuze-Guattari, is circumscribed by affective relations just as much as it is a physical boundary, and this helps make sense of the totalizing references in the catalogue (3 πάντ', 8 πάντων, 9 οὐδέν, 13-14 πάντ'… πάντα… πάντῃ…, 23 οὐδέν, 24 μοῦνον, etc.). What falls outside these conditions of relation is without meaning: neither stone (17), winter (25), nor public scorn (79) have any effect.

Multiplicity and otherness (χωρίς)

> Les loups-garous une fois morts se transforment en vampires. Ce n'est pas étonnant, tant le devenir et la multiplicité sont une seule et même chose (Deleuze-Guattari 1980: 305)

For Semonides, as for Deleuze-Guattari, difference is indexed by multiplicity. The tension between the conjunction of states within entries and the clear-cut divisions of the list is raised in the poem's first line. As with the list in Semonides' other major iambic fragment,[17] the female types are

---

16 Osborne 2001: 56, 'Semonides 7 can be seen as an exploration of the way that men define themselves against women, but at the same time depend upon, desire, and cannot do without that foil to their own roles'.

17 Semon. fr. 1.3 νόος δ' οὐκ ἐπ' ἀνθρώποισιν: the catalogue follows in line seven, providing specific examples to justify the claim. It seems that a third such catalogue has been lost, Semon. fr. 42 (= Stob. II 1.10) ῥεῖα θεοὶ κλέπτουσιν ἀνθρώπων νόον, cf. Renehan 1983: 8-9. Other points of comparison between fragments one and

introduced by a tag line or theme,[18] for which the catalogue serves as corroboration, 1-2:

> χωρὶς γυναικὸς θεὸς ἐποίησεν νόον
>
> τὰ πρῶτα.
>
> God made the mind of woman different at first.

Our text begins with the word χωρίς, and a prepositional construction, set up by word-placement — whereby we initially read 'separate from woman'[19] — soon gives way to an ambiguous use of the

---

seven are the use of pronouns to structure the catalogue and reference to Zeus as θεός. Note too the faint verbal reminiscences at fr. 1.7 ἄπρηκτον ὁρμαίνοντας ~ fr. 7.20 ἐμπέδως ἄπρηκτον αὐονὴν ἔχει and fr. 1.1 βαρύκτυπος ~ fr. 7.40 βαρυκτύποισι. Klinger 1918 argued that fragments one and seven were from the same poem. The distinction between stanza, poem, and collection may not have been any clearer for iambus of this period than for elegy (on which see Faraone 2008).

18 There is evidence that the opening words of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* were understood from at least the time of Aristotle to introduce the larger theme of the work (*Rh.* III 14.1415[a]6, further references at Clay 1992: 113[1], McGill 2006). The recurrence of formal features in both sets of lines (Bassett 1923, esp. 340), comparable also to the openings of the *Homeric Hymns* (Janko 1981: 9-10), suggests an awareness of the special function of the first words of a text long before Aristotle. Functional grammar also uses the designation 'theme' to refer to words in this first position of a sentence (Allan 2014, with further references on page 184). Marg has previously noted that χωρίς is a theme word (1938: 6, 'Eine Art These eröffnet das Gedicht') but thinks that it unequivocally means 'Unterschiedlich' or 'various', and that this sense maps onto the structure of the catalogue (1938: 6-7, cf. Loraux 1978: 55).

19 The construction with genitive at Pi. *O.* 9.41 χωρὶς ἀθανάτων gives a parallel for the sense 'separate from'; Semon. fr. 1.3 νόος δ' οὐκ ἐπ' ἀνθρώποισιν gives a parallel for νόος as 'reason' and the general structure of the sentence using the preposition. The meaning could then be that *God made woman devoid of reason.* George Buchanan (1506-82) was apparently the first to recognize this possibility in his Latin translation of the text: *Primum feorfùm à fœmina mentem Deus | creavit* (1676: 336). Although Radermacher (1947: 160) and Lloyd-Jones (1970: 63) have upheld this view, most commentators give it no mention or reject the possibility (Verdenius 1968: 133, Pellizer-Tedeschi 1990: 119). For commentators' unease with the syntax of this line and its ambiguity, note how Koeler (1781: 23) begins his discussion by altering word-order; similarly, Pellizer-Tedeschi (1990: 119), 'l'apparente durezza del χωρίς unito con il singolare νόον'; see also the following note.

adverb. Whether χωρίς means 'differently from one another'[20] or 'differently from man',[21] clearly variegation is the word. Semonides' use of the singular γυναικός speaks against the first option, whereas the lack of a genitive ἀνδρός speaks against the second.[22] We are left with a triple ambiguity in the word χωρίς, which refers at once 1. to the senselessness of the female characters,[23] 2. to the variety of types represented by the catalogue, and 3. to the underlying anxiety about the combination man-woman, whether sexual[24] or social.[25] Each of these three interpretations has been (repeatedly) argued over in the scholarship, to the exclusion of the other two; somehow the possibility that a word meaning 'differently' or 'variously' might be purposefully ambiguous has so far been overlooked.

The poem looks to substantiate its thesis by means of a catalogue which expounds and expands on the introductory χωρίς, presenting a set of assemblages whose components are alike in being other — where the otherness of women to men is matched by the otherness of the animal and elemental to the human.[26] As already noted above, the poem's speaker has the perspective of a

---

20 Most commentators have understood 'differently from one another', 'variously' to be the primary or only meaning of the line, e.g. von Sybel (1873: 327), Wilhelm (1949: 40), Campbell (1982²: 187), 'χωρίς: either "differently" (i.e. from the mind of man), or more probably "variously, in different ways"', Pellizer-Tedeschi 1990, Tammaro 1993, Gerber 1970: 57. Convincing parallels for this sense of χωρίς are listed in Verdenius' commentary (1968: 133).

21 Blomfield: *seorsum a viris* (1832⁴: 241 [*ad* A. *Ag.* 620]). Similarly Edmonds (1931: I 217), Adrados (1990³: I 155), and Lloyd-Jones (1975: 63), 'Would it really have been so difficult for such an audience [of men] to understand by "separately" "separately from us"? … the slight awkwardness of γυναικός would be removed'.

22 One may therefore discard Koeler's attempts at emendation to the plural (1781: 24), whether γυναικῶν or γυναῖκας (the latter once again suggested by Schneidewin [1838-9: 199], followed by Ahrens [1844: 839]); this merely reduces the line's complexity.

23 Reflected in the way so many of the female types lack the ability to distinguish between alternatives, as noticed by Lefkowitz 1977: 691-2.

24 Williams 2010.

25 E.g. ξεῖνος (19, 29), ἑταῖρος (49), γείτων (55), δι' ἄστεος πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις (74).

26 For the otherness of women in Greek thought, see Lloyd 1966: 17, 48-65. For the otherness of animals to humans, e.g. S. fr. 941.12 (θήρ), Archil. fr. 177 W (θηρίον), Hdt. 1.119 (θηρίον). When the word θηρίον is applied to human beings, it is derogatory or ironic, a usage particularly common in Old Comedy (Ar. *Nu.* 184, *Eq.* 273, *V.* 24), where it is often used as a form of address (Ar. *V.* 448, *Av.* 87, *Pl.* 440, cf. Dickey 1996: 186). A sub-category of this usage is as an insult against women, e.g. [Epich.] fr. 247.1, Ar. *Lys.* 468, 1014, *Ec.* 1104, Alex. fr. 291, Anaxil. fr. 20.31, Men. fr. 378 (= Stob. IV 22.181), Men. *Mon.* 342 Pernigotti.

neighbour — and this places us at yet a further remove (Osborne 2005: 23).

There may be another ambiguity behind χωρίς, if we are to hear χορὸς γυναικῶν in χωρὶς γυναικός.[27] For the group of women described in the poem does evoke a kind of mock-chorus,[28] standing in marked contrast to choruses of younger women known from this same period of Greek literary history. In place of young maidens, who form a chorus of ten in Alcman's *Partheneion* (fr. 1.99, δεκ[άς, with scholium *ad loc.*),[29] we find instead a group of ten married women. The mutability or mediation of the lyric chorus of maidens includes its ability to adopt animal personae (Alc. fr. 1.47),[30] and this modality is not gratuitous: it reflects a common metaphor of pre-marital education as akin to the taming of a wild animal.[31] Both Alcman's poem and later tragic versions of the *partheneia* employ the mythological motif of the girl who metamorphoses into an animal in place of sexual union (Swift 2010: 180, 197, 201, 205, 228); here perpetual virginity is symbolized by an animal nature. Over against this motif, the figures of Semonides' poem both are married women and

---

27 While the expression χορὸς γυναικῶν is not found in this period of Greek literature, the use of χορός with a genitive of the constituent group is very regular (e.g. *Od.* 12.318, 18.194). The paranomasia is perhaps noticed as an imperfect spoonerism (ο ~ ω, ί ≠ ο). It might also be relevant that ω is not always a distinct letter of the alphabet in this period. Our first evidence for the letter omega is a Parian sherd dated to c. 700 BCE (*EG* I 159-60 = Guarducci 1964: 132, Powell 1989: 336[68], Miller 2014: 163). Semonides of Amorgos is said to have been a colonist from Samos active in the middle of the seventh century. Omega was not in use in Central Ionic at this time (e.g. the Nikandre inscription, Miller 2014: 150-1), so that Semonides may well have been familiar with both forms of notation.

28 Herodotus describes the ritual abuse of local women by female choruses on Aegina and Epidaurus. In the case of Aegina, this abuse functioned to propotiate the gods Damia and Auxesia for the relocation of their statues: Hdt. 5.83 ἱδρυσάμενοι δὲ ἐν τούτῳ τῷ χώρῳ θυσίῃσί τε σφέα καὶ χοροῖσι γυναικηίοισι κερτομίοισι ἱλάσκοντο … κακῶς δὲ ἠγόρευον οἱ χοροὶ ἄνδρα μὲν οὐδένα, τὰς δὲ ἐπιχωρίας γυναῖκας.

29 On the number of choreutes in Alcman, see Page 1937: 99-100, Tsantsanoglou 2012: 97-111, esp. 108. Calame (2001: 21-2) gives evidence from vases in favour of choruses of ten young girls for the period from the end of the eighth century to the middle of the fifth.

30 On the mutability and mediating function of the chorus in general, see Gagné-Hopman 2013. For the mutability of the chorus of young girls, note for example how the Delian maidens *know how to imitate the voices of all men: h.Ap.* 162-4 πάντων δ' ἀνθρώπων φωνὰς καὶ κρεμβαλιαστύν | μιμεῖσθ' ἴσασιν· φαίη δέ κεν αὐτὸς ἕκαστος | φθέγγεσθ'· οὕτω σφιν καλὴ συνάρηρεν ἀοιδή.

31 This is most commonly but not exclusively framed as the taming of a mare, cf. Calame 2001: 238-44, esp. 238-9 with notes 120-1.

yet maintain their untamed animal guises. Semonides thereby undercuts the traditional association of domesticity with domestication. Some of the visual and performative description in Semonides' poem may be meaningful in the light of choral performance: verbs of movement are perversions of dance (4 κυλίνδεται, 14 πλανωμένη, 58 περιτρέχει), and while πρόσωπα (73) is probably not meant to recall a mask,[32] the neighbourhood community around the female types is framed as a group of spectators (29 ἐπαινέσει μιν ξεῖνος ἐν δόμοις ἰδών, 67-8 καλὸν μὲν ὦν θέημα τοιαύτη γυνή | ἄλλοισι τῷ δ' ἔχοντι γίνεται κακόν, 73-4 αἴσχιστα μὲν πρόσωπα· τοιαύτη γυνή | εἶσιν δ' ἄστεος πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις γέλως).[33] The chorus-members in Alcman are individually identified in a list of their ten names (fr. 1.67-77), to which we may compare the ten mismatched figures in Semonides.[34]

The first entry in the catalogue is the only one to begin mid-line and functions as an elaboration on the introductory theme-word χωρίς. More specifically, this entry associates disorder with filth, 2-6:

> τὴν μὲν ἐξ ὑὸς τανύτριχος,
>
> τῇ πάντ' ἀν' οἶκον βορβόρῳ πεφυρμένα
>
> ἄκοσμα κεῖται καὶ κυλίνδεται χαμαί·

---

32 The earliest identifiable instance of πρόσωπα with the meaning *mask* is Pl. com. fr. 142. Thespis is said to have invented the theatrical mask (*TrGF* 1 T 1); although the story is probably apocryphal, it suggests that the use of masks was generally restricted to theatrical performance.

33 This performative reading of the passage is strongest for the horse and ape-women. The horse-woman's hair may be a visual cue (57 ἁβρὴ χαιτέεσσ', 65 χαίτην ἐκτενισμένην φορεῖ, cf. 2 τανύτριχος). The corruption †τεσποδιης† in the opening line on the ass-woman is usually understood to contain a word meaning 'grey', which would be another visual cue. Fenno's emendation of these letters to στερεῆς τε *obdurate* need not break this pattern if that adjective can indeed suggest both '"hardened and also persistently beaten" (in respect to her hide) [and] "stubborn and also inured to beatings" (with reference to her character)' (2005: 409-10).

34 Choral individuation refers to the individual identification of chorus members. Choruses that remain individuated throughout a play are sometimes described as 'multiform'. Choral individuation was widespread among the now fragmentary plays of Old Comedy (Wilson 1977) and especially common among animal choruses (Sifakis 1971, Rothwell 2007), for example Aristophanes' *Birds* (lines 267-309). The individual naming of chorus members in Alcman suggests that individuation was not limited to Old Comedy; a second example outside comedy is A. *Ag.* 1345-70, in which each choreute speaks a couplet in reaction to the king's death.

αὐτὴ δ' ἄλουτος ἀπλύτοις ἐν εἵμασιν   5

ἐν κοπρίῃσιν ἡμένη πιαίνεται.

One from a bristly sow, through whom all things in the

house lie in disorder, having been sullied with grime, and

they roll around on the ground: but she, unwashed in

unwashed clothing, sits on the dungheap, fattening

herself.

The disorder extends to our very interpretation of these lines. These are muddy lines, because of a particularly muddy τῇ: is this a dative of possession, of agent (the woman), or of origin (the sow)? An unspecified πάντ(α) is subject of the relative, and this too illustrates a consummate disorder: things here not only exist in a state of disorder (ἄκοσμα κεῖται), but roll about (κυλίνδεται). The whole domain is in flux; one thinks of Plato's parody of Heraclitus (Pl. *Cra.* 402A πάντα χωρεῖ καὶ οὐδὲν μένει).[35] Woman and pig are mixed in here somewhere as well: lines five and six associate the disorder in the house more clearly with the pig-woman who is their cause (τῇ). She is unwashed and in unwashed clothes, and there is no need to clean up the disparity of the words ἄλουτος and ἀπλύτοις, nor the inelegant succession ἐν εἵμασιν | ἐν κοπρίῃσιν, which are in fact the same, once we belatedly interpret βορβόρῳ πεφυρμένα to mean stained with excrement. φύρω has the sense of a fabric clotting with thick fluid and might be translated *smear*.[36] The absurdly repulsive innuendo of the final line is that the pig-woman ingests the filth of her own creation. This includes her own excrement, a greater symbol of disorder even than filth or mud — she is this disorder through and through.[37]

Filth here stands not only for consummate disorder, but also for a lack of comprehension of the

---

35 Cf. Heraclit. fr. 13 Kirk (= 22B13 D-K[7]), which expresses the paradox that *pigs delight in dirt* (13a βορβόρῳ χαίρειν, 13b ὕες ἥδονται βορβόρῳ μᾶλλον ἢ καθαρῷ ὕδατι).

36 Lloyd-Jones 1975: 65, 'The basic sense of φύρω is to mix something dry with something wet.'

37 On excreta, see Wilkins 2000: 28-9, with references. Excrement is once again connected with lists in chapter thirteen of Rabelais' *Gargantua*, 'Comment Grandgousier congneut l'esperit merveilleux de Gargantua à l'invention d'un torchecul'. Various modes of listing are used to name the many furs, fabrics, herbs, instruments, and live animals Gargantua tests as alternatives to loo-roll. Note especially the mention of paper: 'Je me torchay de foin, de paille, de bauduffe, de bourre, de laine, de papier' (cited from Huchon's edition, 1994: 38-42).

other, reflecting two aspects of the opening word χωρίς. This dual association of filth with both disorder and otherness is also noted by Plato in the *Parmenides*, 130C-D:

> ἦ καὶ περὶ τῶνδε, ὦ Σώκρατες, ἃ καὶ γελοῖα δόξειεν ἂν εἶναι, οἷον θρὶξ καὶ πηλὸς καὶ ῥύπος ἢ ἄλλο τι ἀτιμότατόν τε καὶ φαυλότατον, ἀπορεῖς εἴτε χρὴ φάναι καὶ τούτων ἑκάστου εἶδος εἶναι χωρίς, ὂν ἄλλο αὖ ἢ ὧν ‹τι› ἡμεῖς μεταχειριζόμεθα, εἴτε καὶ μή; οὐδαμῶς, φάναι τὸν Σωκράτη, ἀλλὰ ταῦτα μέν γε ἅπερ ὁρῶμεν, ταῦτα καὶ εἶναι· εἶδος δέ τι αὐτῶν οἰηθῆναι εἶναι μὴ λίαν ἦ ἄτοπον.

> Is this also the case about those things, Socrates, which seem to be laughable, such as hair and mud and dirt, or whatever else is altogether worthless and base — are you not at a loss as to whether it is necessary to say that each of these things also has a separate form, which would be yet a different one from those we have dealt with so far — is this so or not? Not at all, said Socrates, but these things are precisely the things we really see: and it would be altogether absurd to think there were some form of them.

Within part of a larger conversation about whether forms are properly distinct (χωρίς) from the objects which participate in them (from 129D), Socrates denies that hair, mud, dirt, and the like have corresponding forms; instead, they are exactly what can be seen. In other words, grime and dirt are emblematic of the real-world, material existence to things, which sets one important challenge to the explanatory power of the theory of forms in this dialogue. It is notable that hair recurs alongside dirt both in Plato and Semonides.[38] There is a material reality implied by dirt, grime, and excrement, at once undeniable and distasteful (ἀτιμότατον, φαυλότατον), which cannot be reduced to a more general, abstract term. Where we might group these things under the general term 'filth' or the concept of 'abjection,'[39] Plato has no recourse to abstractions. Instead, as in Semonides, the list is used to contain what falls outside normal and normative systems of order: θρίξ, πηλός, ῥύπος are drawn into a list, understood in apposition to ἅ, bracketed by οἷον and a generalizing *etcetera* (ἢ ἄλλο τι).

The otherness of the female types is also to be construed in terms of one another, further

---

38 Hair is also found at Semon. fr. 10a.

39 Osborne has noted the relevance of Kristeva's concept of abjection to Semonides: both connect disorder with disgust (2001: 45).

affirming the poem's association of variety with difference.[40] Thematically, the first entry is contrasted with that of the horse-woman, who leaves another even to remove excrement from the house (58, 60 δούλι' ἔργα καὶ δύην περιτρέπει … οὔτε κόπρον ἐξ οἴκου βάλοι) and washes herself repeatedly (63-4 λοῦται δὲ πάσης ἡμέρης ἄπο ῥύπον | δίς, ἄλλοτε τρίς, καὶ μύροις ἀλείφεται); hair is also a focus for both of these types (2 ταχύτριχος, 57 χαιτέεσσ', 65-6 αἰεὶ δὲ χαίτην ἐκτενισμένην φορεῖ | βαθεῖαν, ἀνθέμοισιν ἐσκιασμένην). The specificity of these links suggests that interaction between the entries is intentional and meaningful, disorganized but not random. Further indications of this sort of pairing are found throughout the catalogue. Perhaps the clearest suggestion of pairing are the two non-animal elemental types, who are opposites in the sense that the one is physically and affectively inert (earth), the other animated and emotionally explosive (sea). The same entry is often subject to multiple pairs of opposition. For example, while the sow may be understood in opposition to the horse, the horse can also be linked to the ass: 'As the poem unfolds, we may observe that this portrait of the hard and hardened she-ass and her hard-working offspring will serve as an effective contrast to the mare, delicate and long-haired (57 ἵππος ἁβρὴ χαιτέεσσ'), and to her daughter, the horse-woman, who avoids slavish labors and pain (58)' (Fenno 2005: 410). Similarly, earth and sea seem an obvious pair, yet the weasel-woman makes her bedmate seasick (54 ναυσίη διδοῖ); this is far and away the earliest use of the word ναυσίη *seasickness*, suggesting a live metaphor which recalls the description of the sea in a rage a few lines earlier (39-40 πολλάκις δὲ μαίνεται | βαρυκτύποισι κύμασιν φορεομένη).[41] The sea-woman is herself compared to a bitch in a simile (34), although there has already been a type drawn from this animal (12-20). Many other pairings are possible.[42] Some entries describe a multiplicity of mental states for individual

---

40 Deleuze-Guattari 1980: 294, 'Oui, tout animal est ou peut être une meute, mais d'après des degrés de vocation variable, qui rendent plus ou moins facile la découverte de multiplicité, de teneur en multiplicité, qu'il contient actuellement ou virtuellement suivant le cas.'

41 These lines complicate the relationship between sea and woman in the simile by momentarily placing the woman in the position of a sailor who is buffeted about (cf. *Od.* 5.327, 12.67-8).

42 Alain Blanchard draws a wide variety of possible connections: 'Ce qui frappe immédiatement, c'est la parenté entre la femme truie (type n° 1) et la femme guenon (type n° 9) : l'une et l'autre ont une apparence répugnante' (2003: 81), 'Avec la renarde (type n° 2) et la cavale (type n° 8), nous restons dans le domaine de l'apparence' (2003: 81), 'Avec la chienne (type n° 3) et la belette (type n° 7), nous accédons à un nouveau palier. Il ne s'agit plus d'apparence

external to themselves: only the bee and, although barely (44-5 μόγις … κἀπονήσατο), the ass; the focus instead is on sexual and alimentary appetites (24 ἔργων δὲ μοῦνον ἐσθίειν ἐπίσταται). As the sow-woman sees no division between interiority and exteriority in her cycle of excrement and reingestion, so the ass-woman receives both food and sex equally (48 ὁμῶς … ἐδέξατο): there is parity between the functions of this body's apertures. The husband's fantasy of knocking out his wife's teeth can also be understood in this light: it is an attempt to disrupt a point of access between his wife's body and the external world. It is also a misapplication of the Homeric model to the wrong animal: Iros threatens to knock out Odyssey-beggar's teeth *like those of a crop-destroying sow* (συὸς ὣς ληιβοτείρης).[45] The husband attempts to stop the yapping, but also to divide up, to render this compound elemental in new ways,[46] to end its becoming-animal. This moment is marked by failure. As the speaker at once admits, this act of violence does not break the association of woman and dog, but only reinforces it: all too common a way in Archaic Greece to treat a dog.

Generation, heredity, inheritance (γένος, φῦλον)

> La propagation par épidémie, par contagion, n'a rien à voir avec la filiation par hérédité, même si les deux thèmes se mélangent et ont besoin l'un de l'autre. Le vampire ne filiationne pas, il contagionne. (Deleuze-Guattari 1980: 295)

The construction of female assemblages in Semonides' poem functions in a variety of ways: the ἐκ used to describe it is both genealogical and material, as is clear from the expressions τὴν δὲ πλάσαντες γηίνην (21), ἐκ θαλάσσης (27), and ἐκ γαλῆς γένος (50) taken collectively. A similar confusion of substance and stock is found in the Hesiodic myth of races, e.g. Hes. *Op.* 176 γένος

ὕβρισε γυναῖκά τινα, σκώπτων ἐκείνην εἰς τὸ παιδογόνον ὡς ἀκάθαρτον. Semon. fr. 8 might refer to sexual penetration as an eel in slime (Gerber 1979: 22-3).

45 *Od.* 18.28-9 χαμαὶ δέ κε πάντας ὀδόντας | γναθμῶν ἐξελάσαιμι συὸς ὣς ληιβοτείρης. The passage is noted in the commentaries of Gerber (1970: 59) and Campbell (1982²: 188). Odysseus has been compared to a woman in the previous sentence (*Od.* 18.27 γρηὶ καμινοῖ ἴσος).

46 For Deleuze-Guattari, becoming-animal is catylized by specific interactions of the bacterial, viral, and mollecular nature, to which they collectively refer as a compound's 'becoming-elemental' (1980: 304-5).

ἐστὶ σιδήρεον.[47] Moreover, the notion of generation (γένος) at work in Semonides' poem is ambiguous, in that it is used to refer both to animal species, as in the case of the weasel-woman (50 ἐκ γαλῆς γένος), and to progeny, as in the case of the bee-woman (87 τεκοῦσα καλὸν κὠνομάκλυτον γένος). In this way, the catalogue of types hijacks the tradition of Archaic genealogy, by turns replacing and conflating the idea of heredity with that of species. In the entry on the horse-woman, for example, we find both ideas at work at once: τὴν δ' ἵππος ἐγείνατο (57).[48] The horse gives birth to the horse-woman. Perhaps the sexual undertones of the poem (48-9, 53, 62, 75) are humorous in part because they suggest zoophilia. Moreover, the conceit of birth from an animal implies that the female types are biologically constituted in part as animals, so that female and animal parts are not always distinguished on a physiological level.

In some measure, these painstaking distinctions are informed by earlier texts. The same confusion of the elemental, biological, and parturient is paralleled by Semonides' best-known model, the description of the Maiden in Hesiod's *Theogony* (570-612). Although the close literary affiliation of Semonides' poem with this passage has long been recognized, a number of details have been overlooked. First and foremost, the format of Semonides' entries recalls one line in particular, which uses the feminine article (ἐκ τῆς) to connect the Maiden genealogically with all women: Hes. *Th.* 590 ἐκ τῆς γὰρ γένος ἐστὶ γυναικῶν θηλυτεράων.[49] This line resembles the opening formula of the entries in Semonides' catalogue in its use of the feminine article as a pronoun and of the preposition ἐκ, in its association of genealogical filiation with biological constitution, and in the straightforwardly sexist content.[50]

Second, if the Maiden is a model for the Semonidean catalogue as a whole, she is also specifically a model for the woman made of earth. The degree to which this is the case has not been fully elucidated. In the *Theogony*, the Maiden is fabricated by Zeus (Hes. *Th.* 513-14 Διὸς πλαστὴν …

---

47 Later authors continue to exploit this idea, e.g. Theog. 189 πλοῦτος ἔμειξε γένος.

48 Possibly also in αὐτομήτορα (12), on which see further note 56 below.

49 For Semonides' familiarity with the *Theogony* and the *Works and Days,* see Janko 1982: 96-8. Verdenius (1968: 133) already suggests a specific connection with the passage in question, and with its immediate context, especially Hes. *Th.* 608, although he does not connect the structure of this line to the entries in Semonides' list.

50 Semonides' awareness of this line may also be reflected in his reference to Hunger entering the home (fr. 7.100-1), which may recall Poverty entering the house just after the mention of Pandora (Hes. *Th.* 593).

γυναῖκα, παρθένον) and moulded from earth by Hephaistos (571-2 γαίης γὰρ σύμπλασσε περικλυτὸς Ἀμφιγυήεις | παρθένῳ αἰδοίῃ ἴκελον Κρονίδεω διὰ βουλάς, cf. *Op.* 61, 70). Not only is Semonides' earth-woman constructed using the same root (21 τὴν δὲ πλάσαντες ... Ὀλύμπιοι),[51] but a recollection of the Hesiodic passage also explains the group designation Ὀλύμπιοι (Zeus plus Hephaistos), where Zeus alone is held to account for these women everywhere else in Semonides' poem (θεός in 1, 7, 25, Ζεύς in 72, 93, 94, 96, 115). Finally, in Hesiod, Prometheus' gift of fire to man is repaid by the gift of a woman made from earth (Hes. *Th.* 570-71 αὐτίκα δ᾽ ἀντὶ πυρὸς τεῦξεν κακὸν ἀνθρώποισι· | γαίης γὰρ σύμπλασσε κτλ.), and this too seems to be recalled by Semonides. In Semonides, the gift is not fire but a lame woman: τὴν δὲ πλάσαντες γηΐνην Ὀλύμπιοι | ἔδωκαν ἀνδρὶ πηρόν (21-22). This woman is lame in the sense that she is impassive — so impassive that she precisely does not draw near to the fire: κοὐδ' ἢν κακὸν χειμῶνα ποιήσῃ θεός, | ῥιγῶσα δίφρον ἆσσον ἕλκεται πυρός (25-6).[52] Furthermore, fire (πῦρ) is repeatedly and exclusively found in the genitive in Hesiod's account of Prometheus' deception (Hes. *Th.* 563, 566, 569, 570), so that Semonides' πηρόν may specifically recall Hesiod's πυρός.

The idea of human composition from earth and water, which was widespread in the Archaic period,[53] is exploited by Semonides for the idea of hybridity which it allows. Nor is this idea exclusively adopted from the *Theogony*: Semonides' second elemental woman, the woman made from the sea (27 τὴν δ' ἐκ θαλάσσης), provides a comparable tongue-in-cheek re-tooling of a specific passage from Homer. The sea-woman recalls Patroclus' slur regarding Achilles' birth, when he is said to have been born not of Peleus and Thetis, but of grey sea and sheer rock, *Il.* 16.33-5:

νηλεές, οὐκ ἄρα σοί γε πατὴρ ἦν ἱππότα Πηλεύς,

οὐδὲ Θέτις μήτηρ· γλαυκὴ δέ σε τίκτε θάλασσα

πέτραι τ᾽ ἠλίβατοι, ὅτι τοι νόος ἐστὶν ἀπηνής.

---

51 Fraenkel 1975: 2002², Janko 1982: 96-8, Hunter 2014: 160-5.

52 Adopting Schneidewin's emendation κοὐδ' ἢν (1838-9: 200) over Ahrens' κὤταν (1844: 839).

53 In the *Theogony,* Pandora is made of earth alone; in the *Works and Days,* she is made of both earth and water (Hes. *Op.* 61). Neither view has priority: the combination of earth and water is found already at *Il.* 7.99 ἀλλ᾽ ὑμεῖς μὲν πάντες ὕδωρ καὶ γαῖα γένοισθε. Hector's dead body is *mute earth* at *Il.* 24.54 κωφὴν γὰρ δὴ γαῖαν ἀεικίζει μενεαίνων, cf. Lloyd 1966: 200-1. These elemental theories are later explicitly conceptualized by the pre-Socratics, e.g. Xenoph. 22в33 D-K⁷, cf. West on Hes. *Th.* 571 (1966: 326).

Ruthless, for your father was not the horseman Peleus,

nor was your mother Thetis; but the grey sea and sheer

rocks bore you, since your mind is unyielding.

In contrast to our two other instances of birth by water in Homer, the reference here is not to water itself (ὕδωρ, *Il.* 7.99 ἀλλ' ὑμεῖς μὲν πάντες ὕδωρ καὶ γαῖα γένοισθε) nor to Oceanus (Ὠκεανός, *Il.* 14.246 Ὠκεανοῦ, ὅς περ γένεσις πάντεσσι τέτυκται), but to the sea (θάλασσα) in particular.[54] The interpretative force of this revisionist Achillean genealogy is remarkably similar to the one found in the opening words of Semonides' catalogue: birth by sea and rocks explain Achilles' disposition or mind (νόος), as do the lineages of the Semonidean types (1 νόον).[55] Patroclus claims that Achilles' birth from water has an impact on his character diametrically opposed to that which it has on Semonides' sea-woman, who is not obdurate but supremely lively — an inversion of metaphor to which we may compare Semonides' contrastive reuse of the Hesiodic slur against women as drones in the *Theogony* (Janko 1982: 96-8).

Semonides' models for the idea of animal generation are varied. One is probably generic: the poem appears to draw on the intermingling of human and animal worlds in fable (Aesop 140 Perry, cf. Lloyd-Jones 1975: 21, Brown 1997: 73[16]) and ainos (Archil. fr. 177 W). The she-fox, who is experienced in everything (8 πάντων ἴδριν) may be a riff on Archilochus (fr. 201 πόλλ' οἶδ' ἀλώπηξ, ἀλλ' ἐχῖνος ἓν μέγα), although there is no precise verbal link (Marg 1938: 10, Gerber 1970: 58, Pellizer-Tedeschi 1990: 121). The fox is a regular in fable, and the reference may be to the whole of that generic portrait of the animal. Other animal portraits find justification as allusions to earlier poetry. For example, the she-bitch recalls Helen's speech to Hector at *Il.* 6.342-58 (344 ἐμεῖο κυνός, 356 εἵνεκ' ἐμεῖο κυνός). One indication that Semonides may be thinking of his passage in particular is found in the hapax αὐτομήτορα (12). If this refers to autogenesis,[56] it would echo

---

54 The trope of being born of sea and sheer rocks is often recalled in Latin poetry: Catull. 64.154-6, Verg. *Aen.* 4.365-8, Ov. *Ep.* 7.37-40, cf. Stat. *Theb.* 3.693-5.

55 Walter Marg sees a contrast between the word's use in Homer to describe momentary dispositions, and its use in Semonides to refer to innate, unchanging character (1938: 44-7).

56 Martin West suggests that the word conflates ideas of autogenesis and promiscuity (1974: 178). Another possibility is that it refers to heredity, so that the bitch-woman is *the very image of her mother* (Marg 1938: 15, Gerber 1970: 58, Campbell 1982²: 188, Pellizer-Tedeschi 1990: 124), i.e. her animal type, as in the case of the horse, who gives birth

Helen's wish to have been carried away at birth (345 ὅτε με πρῶτον τέκε μήτηρ κτλ.).[57] Of course, the comparison of women to dogs also has broader currency in the Archaic world (Arch. fr. 196a.41 W, Semon. fr. 7.34-6). Indeed, Semonides may also allude to Skylla, an *unpreventable disaster* ἄπρηκτον ἀνίην (*Od.* 12.223), who is reduced here to an *unpreventable yelp* ἄπρηκτον αὐονήν.[58] In addition to generic and specific allusions, the Homeric simile provides a third important model for Semonides.[59] The portrait of the she-ass, for example, may draw from the simile at *Il.* 11.558-62 (Gerber 1970: 60). Similar points could be made for the figures modelled on weasel, mare, and monkey.[60] Semonides' poem uses a plethora of models for the idea that humans can take on animal dimensions. This positions the catalogue of types within the larger history of such interactions: Semondies' catalogue collects specimens of human-animal interaction from throughout the Archaic literary corpus.

These many and various ideas about generation are given over to Semonides ready-made. The Maiden and others are gifted by Zeus to mankind (21-2 Ὀλύμπιοι | ἔδωκαν, 72 ὤπασεν), even as the woman-animal-elemental combinations are inherited by Semonides and his audience as poetic tradition. This makes the catalogue into a list of gifts, recalling the custom of gifting women in Archaic networks of exchange, and the presence of women in ancient lists of gifts. For example, when Odysseus in the guise of Epiretus tells Laertes of the gifts he imagines having given to himself, the

---

to the horse-woman (57 τὴν δ' ἵππος … ἐγείνατο).

57 It may also be relevant that Helen refers to her marriage (*Il.* 6.349-51) and to Zeus sending an evil bane on mankind because of her shamelessness (*Il.* 6.357 οἷσιν ἐπὶ Ζεὺς θῆκε κακὸν μόρον).

58 Skylla also barks (15 λέληκεν ~ *Od.* 12.85 λελακυῖα, noted by Campbell 1982²: 188), is unstoppable, and gives a nasty bite with her teeth (*Od.* 12.91) in contrast to Semonides' bitch-woman, who has her teeth knocked out. These similarities may be due to the fact that Skylla is partly modelled on a pup or σκύλαξ (*Od.* 12.86), in which case they are stock-in-trade associations with dogs rather than allusions to Homer.

59 Fraenkel set discussion of the Homeric simile on new ground by suggesting that it might operate in a variety of different ways (1921). Semonides will be exploiting both specific similes and more generally the confusion of human and animal in such comparisons, especially insofar as Homeric similes are elaborated for their own sake.

60 For the weasel, see Borthwick 1968 and Bettini 2013, cf. Brown 1997: 73-4. Aesop 50 Perry tells the story of the metamorphosis of a weasel into a married woman, who retains something of her animal nature within. For the mare and the ass, see Griffith 2006. For the monkey, see McDermott 1935 and Steiner 2016.

four women he includes provide a sort of climax, *Od.* 24.273-9:[61]

> καί οἱ δῶρα πόρον ξεινήια, οἷα ἐῴκει.
>
> χρυσοῦ μέν οἱ δῶκ' εὐεργέος ἑπτὰ τάλαντα,
>
> δῶκα δέ οἱ κρητῆρα πανάργυρον ἀνθεμόεντα,   275
>
> δώδεκα δ' ἁπλοΐδας χλαίνας, τόσσους δὲ τάπητας,
>
> τόσσα δὲ φάρεα καλά, τόσους δ' ἐπὶ τοῖσι χιτῶνας,
>
> χωρὶς δ' αὖτε γυναῖκας, ἀμύμονα ἔργα ἰδυίας,
>
> τέσσαρας εἰδαλίμας, ἃς ἤθελεν αὐτὸς ἑλέσθαι.
>
> I also gave him gifts of friendship, as many as was fitting.
>
> I gave him seven talents of wrought gold, an ornate
>
> mixing bowl of solid silver, twelve single-fold cloaks, and
>
> just as many blankets, fine mantles, and tunics, and apart
>
> from these, I gave four shapely women, skilled in flawless
>
> handiwork, whom he himself chose.

The women are marked out as distinct (χωρίς) from the other gifts because of their superior worth, valuable in part for their having been individually (αὐτός) selected; however, they are no different from the other items in the list in being possessions that can be traded.[62] In a much more elaborate list of items, which Agamemnon promises to Achilles in an attempt to entice him to return to battle (*Il.* 9.120-57 = *Il.* 9.264-99 ~ *Il.* 19.243-8), we find tripods, gold, and other material items, horses, a variety of women,[63] and even whole cities — a grand list in which the value of the items is steadily amplified as part of a rhetorical strategy meant to showcase Agamemnon's generosity.[64] Just as whole cities can be reduced to mere entries within a list, so too can living people also be objectified, treated

---

61 Lists of gifts are the most common type of list in Homer, more common even than muster rolls and other registers of proper names, such as genealogies. There is a good overview of lists in Homer at Minchin 2001: 73-99, with bibliography under note one.

62 A parallel use of χωρίς in a list of gifts is found at *Od.* 4.130, χωρὶς δ' αὖθ' Ἑλένῃ ἄλοχος πόρε κάλλιμα δῶρα, cf. *Od.* 9.221-2 and 24.78.

63 Seven women from Lesbos, another twenty Trojans in time to come, and one of Agamemnon's own daughters.

64 This is especially clear from lines 158-61, cf. e.g. Sammons 2008, esp. 354 with note seven, who interprets the expansiveness of this list as an attempt to satisfy the promise of a *boundless gift* (*Il.* 9.120 ἀπερείσι' ἄποινα).

as objects or items in an enumeration.[65]

Mankind inherits the varieties of woman as gifts from Zeus, a note on which the catalogue ends, 94-5:

τὰ δ' ἄλλα φῦλα ταῦτα μηχανῇ Διός

ἔστιν τε πάντα καὶ παρ' ἀνδράσιν μένει.

All these other breeds exist by the contrivance of Zeus

and remain among men.

Semonides' φῦλα recalls the periphrasis φῦλα γυναικῶν, which appears at three other key locations in Archaic poetry:[66] it is found in Hesiod's description of the Maiden (*Th.* 591 τῆς γὰρ ὀλοίιόν ἐστι γένος καὶ φῦλα γυναικῶν),[67] in Agamemnon's extravagant list of gifts (*Il.* 9.130 αἳ κάλλει ἐνίκων φῦλα γυναικῶν = *Il.* 9.272),[68] and in the opening line of the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women* (fr. 1.1 νῦν δὲ γυναικῶν φῦλον ἀείσατε).[69] The demonstrative ταῦτα applies this conceit to the members of Semonides' catalogue: nine of these items are examples of the tribes or species (φῦλα) of woman, where ἄλλα identifies the types other than the bee (Lloyd-Jones 1975: 87, Schear 1984: 48). These worse types remain among men (παρ' ἀδράσιν μένει); these gifts are given to mankind by Zeus, but unlike other ancient gifts, they cannot be traded on or passed off. They also remain in the sense that these species of hybrid pre-exist Semonides' catalogue: they are given over from previous literary tradition, and in Semonides' catalogue they now remain. The plural φῦλα also recalls the many conceptions of generation which underpin the females types. The couplet is not merely a bridge to the second half of the poem; its powerfully ambiguous language displays with kaleidoscopic variety

---

65 Further examples from the *Iliad* are found at Lyons 2003: 96[12].

66 The expression φῦλα γυναικῶν is also restored at Hes. *Cat.* fr. 180.10 M-W and *Cat.* fr. 251.9 M-W, and is found at [Hes.] *Sc.* 4.

67 This line is possibly an interpolation, on which see West *ad loc.* (1966: 329-30). γένος γυναικῶν is found only here in the Archaic period, although there are later uses, e.g. A. *Sept.* 256 ὦ Ζεῦ, γυναικῶν οἷον ὤπασας γένος.

68 These are the only instances of this expression in Homer. Much more common are the expressions φῦλ' ἀνθρώπων and φῦλα θεῶν, which are sometimes used in combination, e.g. *Il.* 5.441-2 οὔ ποτε φῦλον ὁμοῖον | ἀθανάτων τε θεῶν χαμαὶ ἐρχομένων τ' ἀνθρώπων, and seem to imply an ontological division.

69 Robin Osborne has suggested that Semonides is responding specifically to an early version of the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women* (2005: 22-24).

the ideas about hybridity deployed throughout the catalogue.

Conclusion: Categorical Abuse

> … tous les devenirs commencent et passent par le devenir-femme. C'est la clef des autres devenirs. (Deleuze-Guattari 1980: 340)

Lists are used in a variety of ways to express misogynistic ideas in ancient literature. They can devalue by means of repetition, as in Zeus' list of conquests in the *Iliad* (14.313-28), where the accumulation of the names of lovers diminishes their individual importance.[70] The listing of negative characteristics for greater emphasis is also common, as in Lucretius' catalogue of Greek euphemisms used by lovers to mask the defects of the beloved (*DRN* 4.1160-9). Semonides' catalogue shares analogues with both these modes of abuse. It also operates in a third way: this list emphasizes variation and difference within and between entries, making it particularly useful for describing hybrids. The catalogue's architecture places emphasis on the individual unit or entry, and this limited organisation of information creates the potential for disorder between the interstices. Distinctions are emphasized at one level, so that they fall apart at another.

The intersection of misogyny, list, and hybrid extends far beyond the *Female Types*. In what may be a recollection of Semonides' poem,[71] Ovid ends the first book of the *Ars amatoria* with a list of ways the lover should adapt himself in his pursuit of a woman, as a hunter might change tactics in his pursuit of different animals, because, he says, *the hearts of women are various* (*Ars am.* 1.755-6 *sunt diversa puellis | pectora*). These connections also reappear without reference to Semonides, as in Anaxilas fr. 22. This fragment from the Middle Comedy lists associations between hetaera, wild animals, and monsters. Anaxilas' catalogue, like that of Semonides, begins with a statement about its

---

70 This same technique is commonly found in pop songs, like the women's names in Lou Bega's 'Mambo' or those of men in Lady Gaga's 'Alejandro'.

71 *CEG* II 530 shows that Semonides' poem was known in the fourth century BCE (González González 2011). The symposium was probably one means of transmission, especially if the piece was written with such a context in mind, as may be suggested by the first person plural in line 114: ἴσην δ' ἔχοντες μοῖραν οὐ γιγνώσκομεν. Schear suggests that the poem was composed for performance at some sort of sympotic event connected to a wedding, and reflects the sort of joking abuse one might find at a stag do (1984: 40-44).

own operation, here framed as a rhetorical question: ὅστις ἀνθρώπων ἑταίραν ἠγάπησε πώποτε, | οὗ γένος τίς ἂν δύναιτο παρανομώτερον φράσαι; *Who, among those who have ever loved a prostitute, could name a more disreputable race?* παρανομώτερον is ambiguous; it means both *lawless* and more generally *transgressive* (Montanari 2015 *s.v.* παράνομος), in this case with reference to the dissolution of borders between prostitute, animal, and monster. As in Semonides, we find a pun on γένος (fr. 22.2, .5, .6), which sets up the comparison of courtesans to monsters and wild beasts (fr. 22.31 θηρί'). Many of Anaxilas' monsters are mythological hybrids (Χίμαιρα, Σφίγξ), and there is direct reference to the idea of a compound in the pun δράκαιν' ἄμεικτος (fr. 22.3). Anaxilas' catalogue exploits the potential of the list to suggest multiplicity and hybridity in a remarkably similar way to Semonides, although nothing in the language suggests direct interaction between the two texts.

The payoff of reading Semonides in terms of Deleuze-Guattari's becoming-animal is that this opens up ideas about the uses of catalogic literature more generally in the ancient world. Catalogues are able to contain what is other, and they tend to emphasize heterogeneity in whatever form this comes. Lists are therefore used widely for parody, poking fun of what is different: items are held at a distance, unintegrated, various, disorderly. A heightened awareness of Semonides' careful use of the list also reveals the importance of its conceptual frame. The opening line associates variety with otherness, and connects these with the catalogue's structure and contents. The final couplet refers to the complex of ideas about generation found in this list, and hints at Semonides' awareness of his own recycling of earlier literary material relating to hybridity. The *Female Types* is allusive and subtle; it exploits every opportunity of language and register to engender the species of ambiguity detailed in its catalogue.

Works Cited

Adrados, F. R. (1956, 1981², 1990³) *Líricos griegos. Elegiagos y yambógrafos arcaicos* (2 vols), Barcelona.

Ahrens, H. L. (1844) 'Review of "Poetae lyrici Graeci" by Theodor Bergk,' *Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung*, 833-48.

Allan, R. J. (2014) 'Changing the topic position in ancient Greek word order,' *Mnemosyne* 67, 181-213.

Bassett, S. E. (1923) 'The proems of the Iliad and the Odyssey', *AJP* 44.4, 339-48.

Bettini, M. (2013) *Women and weasels: mythologies of birth in ancient Greece and Rome* (trans. E. Eisenach), Chicago and London.

Blanchard, A. (2003) 'Sémonide, fr. 7, v. 1-95 : pourquoi les femmes ne ressemblent-elles pas davantage aux hommes !', in J. Jouanna and J. Leclant (eds.) *La poésie grecque antique. Actes du 13ème colloque de la Villa Kérylos à Beaulieu-sur-Mer les 18 & 19 octobre 2002*, Paris, 77-88.

Blomfield, C. J. (1818, 1822², 1826³, 1832⁴) *ΑΙΣΧΥΛΟΥ ΑΓΑΜΕΜΝΩΝ. Aeschyli Agamemnon ad fidem manuscriptorum emendavit notas et glossarium,* London.

Borthwick, E. K. (1968) 'Seeing weasels: the superstitious background of the Empusa scene in the Frogs', *CQ* 18.2, 200-6.

Brown, C. G. (1997) 'Iambos: Semonides', in D. E. Gerber (ed.) *A companion to the Greek lyric poets*, Leiden, 70-8.

Buchanan, G. (1676) *Buchanani Scot Poemata quae extant*, Amsterdam.

Calame, C. (2001) *Choruses of young women in ancient Greece: their morphology, religious role, and social functions* (trans. D. Collins and J. Orion), Oxford.

Campbell, D. (ed.) (1967, 1982²) *Greek lyric poetry. A selection of early Greek lyric, elegiac and iambic poetry*, London.

Clay, D. (1992) 'Plato's first words', in F. M. Dunn and T. Cole (eds.) *Beginnings in classical literature*, Cambridge.

Deleuze, G. and F. Guattari (1980) *Capitalisme et schizophrénie : mille plateaux*, Paris.

Dickey, E. (1996) *Greek Forms of Address: From Herodotus to Lucian*, Oxford.

Easterling, P. E. (1985) 'Semonides', in P. E. Easterling and B. M. W. Knox (eds.) *The Cambridge history of classical literature volume I: Greek literature*, Cambridge: 153-7.

Edmonds, J. M. (1931) *Elegy and iambus* (2 vols.), Cambridge, MA.

Faraone, C. A. (2008) *The stanzaic architecture of early Greek elegy*, Oxford.

Fenno, J. (2005) 'Semonides 7.43: a hard/stubborn ass', *Mnemosyne* 58.3, 408-411.

Fraenkel, H. F. (1921) *Die homerischen Gleichnisse*, Göttingen.

————— (1975) *Early Greek poetry and philosophy. A history of Greek epic, lyric, and prose to the middle of the fifth century* (trans. M. Hadas and J. Willis), Oxford.

Gagné, R. and M. G. Hopman (eds.) (2013) *Choral mediations in Greek tragedy*, Cambridge.

Gerber, D. E. (1970) *Euterpe. An Anthology of Early Greek Lyric, Elegiac, and Iambic Poetry*, Amsterdam.

————— (1979) 'Varia Semonidea', *Phoenix* 33.1, 19-24.

Germain, G. (1954) *Homère et la mystique des nombres*, Paris.

González González, M. (2011) 'Un eco de Semónides Fr. 7 en "CEG" II 530', *ZPE* 178, 26-28.

Griffith, M. (2006) 'Horsepower and donkeywork: equids and the ancient Greek imagination', *CPh* 101, 185-246, 307-58.

Guarducci, M. (1967) *Epigrafia Greca I.* Rome.

Havers, W. (1927) 'Zur Syntax des Nominativs', *Glotta* 16, 94-127.

Hubbard, T. K. (1994) 'Elemental psychology and the date of Semonides of Amorgos', *AJP* 115.2, 175-197.

Huchon, M. (ed.) (1994) *Rabelais. Oeuvres complètes*, Paris.

Hunter, R. (2014) *Hesiodic voices: studies in the ancient reception of Hesiod's Works and Days*, Cambridge.

Janko, R. (1981) 'The structure of the Homeric hymns: a study in genre', *Hermes* 109.1, 9-24.

————— (1982) *Homer, Hesiod and the hymns. Diachronic development in the epic diction*, Cambridge.

Johnson, C. D. (2012) 'N+2, or a late Renaissance poetics of enumeration', *MLN* 127.5, 1096-1143.

Keuls, E. C. (1985, 1993²) *The reign of the phallus: sexual politics in ancient Athens*, Berkeley.

Kiessling, A. (1864) 'Zu Simonides von Amorgos', *RhM* 19, 136-9.

Klinger, W. (1918) 'Symonides z Amorgos: Jako twórca parodji literackiej', *Eos* 23, 66-95.

Koeler, G. D. (1781) *Simonidis Carmen Instriptum ΠΕΡΙ ΓΥΝΑΙΚωΝ, de mulieribus*, Goettingen.

Kühner, R. and B. Gerth (1898-1904³) *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache* (2 vols.), Hanover and Leipzig.

Lefkowitz, M. R. (1977) 'Review of "females of the species: Semonides on women" by Hugh Lloyd-Jones', *Signs* 2.3, 690-92.

Lloyd, G. E. (1966) *Polarity and analogy: two types of argumentation in early Greek thought*, Cambridge.

Lloyd-Jones, H. (1975) *Females of the species: Semonides on women*, London.

Loraux, N. (1978) 'Sur la race des femmes et quelques-unes de ses tribus', *Arethusa* 11, 43-87. [= (id.) (1981) *Les enfants d'Athéna: idées athéniennes sur la citoyenneté et la division des sexes*, Paris, 75-117.]

Lyons, D. J. (2003) 'Dangerous gifts: ideologies of marriage and exchange in ancient Greece', *CA* 22.1, 93-134.

Marg, W. (1938) *Der Charakter in der Sprache der frühgriechischen Dichtung*, Würzburg.

MacCabe, B. (ed.) (1849) *The wonderful book; or, tales for the merry, stories for the studious, and marvels for the morose. A collection of Arabian tales now first published in the English language*, Dublin.

McDermott, W. C. (1935) 'The ape in Greek literature', *TAPA* 66, 165-76.

McGill, S. (2006) '"Menin Virumque": translating Homer with Virgil in "Epigrammata Bobiensia" 46, 47 and 64', *CJ* 101.4, 425-431.

Miller, D. G. (2014) *Ancient Greek dialects and early authors: introduction to the dialect mixture in Homer, with notes on lyric and Herodotus*, Boston and Berlin.

Minchin, E. (2001) *Homer and the resources of memory: some applications of cognitive theory to the Iliad and the Odyssey*, Oxford.

Montanari, F. (2015) *The Brill Dictionary of Ancient* Greek, M. Goh and Ch. Schroeder (eds.),

Leiden.

Morgan, T. (2005) 'The wisdom of Semonides fragment 7', *CCJ* 51, 72–85.

Müller, C. W (1831) *Nonnulla ad interpretandum carmen Simonidis de mulieribus inscriptum pertinentia*, Jena.

Neil, Th. (2017) 'What is an assemblage?', *SubStance* 46.1, 21-37.

North, H. (1977) 'The mare, the vixen, and the bee: *sophrosyne* as the virtue of women in antiquity', *ICS* 2, 35-48.

Opitz, R. (1891) 'Über den «Weiberspiegel» des Semonides von Amorgos', *Philologus* 50, 13-30.

Osborne, R. (2001) 'The use of abuse: Semonides 7', *CCJ* 47, 47-64.

————— (2005) 'Ordering women in Hesiod's Catalogue', in R. Hunter (ed.) *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women: constructions and reconstructions*, Cambridge, 5-24.

Page, D. (1937) 'The chorus of Alcman's Partheneion', *CQ* 31.2, 94-101.

Payne, M. (2010) *The animal part: human and other animals in the poetic imagination*, Chicago.

Pellizer, A. and I. Tedeschi (1990) *Semonide. Introduzione, testimonianze, testo critico, traduzione e Commento*, Rome.

Powell, B. B. (1989) 'Why was the Greek alphabet invented? The epigraphical evidence', *CA* 8.2: 321-50.

Radermacher, L. (1947) *Weinen und Lachen: Studien über antikes Lebensgefühl.* Vienna.

Renehan, R. (1983) 'The early Greek poets: Some interpretations', *HSCP* 87, 1-29.

Ribbeck, O. (1865) 'Der Frauenspiegel des Simonides von Amorgos', *RhM* 20, 74-89.

Rothwell, K. S. (2007) *Nature, Culture and the Origins of Greek Comedy: A Study of Animal Choruses*, Cambridge.

Sammons, B. (2008) 'Gift, list & story in *Iliad* 9.115-61', *CJ* 103.4, 353-379.

Schear, L. (1984) 'Semonides Fr. 7: Wives and their Husbands', *Échos du monde classique* 28.1, 39-49.

Schmidt, L. (1882) *Ethik der alten Griechen* (2 vols), Berlin.

Schneidewin, F. W. (1838-9) *Delectus poesis Graecorum* (3 vols), Göttingen.

Sifakis, G. M. (1971) *Parabasis and animal choruses: A contribution to the history of Attic comedy,*

London.

Sinclair, T. A. (ed.) (1932) *Hesiod: Works and days*, London. [Repr. 1985.]

Slings, S. R. (1992) 'Written and spoken language: An exercise in the pragmatics of the Greek sentence', *CP* 87.2, 95-109.

———— (1997) 'Figures of speech and their lookalikes: two further exercises in the pragmatics of the Greek sentence', in E. J. Bakker (ed.) *Grammar as interpretation: Greek literature in its linguistic contexts*, Leiden, 169-214.

Snell, B. (1953) *The discovery of the mind: the Greek origins of European thought* (trans. T. G. Rosenmeyer), Oxford.

Stehle, E. (1997) *Performance and gender in ancient Greece: nondramatic poetry in its setting*, Princeton.

Steiner, D. (2016) 'Making monkeys: Archilochus frr. 185–187 W. in performance', in V. Cazzato and A. Lardinois (eds.) *The look of lyric: Greek song and the visual*, Leiden, 108-145.

Swift, L. A. (2010) *The hidden chorus: echoes of genre in tragic lyric*, Oxford.

von Sybel, L. (1873) 'Zu Simonides von Amorgos', *Hermes* 7.3, 327-63.

Tammaro, V. (1993) 'Semon. fr. 7, 1 s. W.', in R. Pretagostini (ed.) *Tradizione e innovazione nella cultura greca da Omero all' età ellenistica*, Rome, 217-20.

Thorp, J. (1989) 'On cases: standing up falling down', *Échos du monde classique* 33.3, 315-331.

Tsantsanoglou, K. (2012) *Of golden manes and silvery faces: the Partheneion 1 of Alcman*, Berlin and Boston.

Verdenius, W. J. (1968) 'Semonides über die Frauen: Ein Kommentar zu Fr. 7', *Mnemosyne* 21.2-3, 132-158.

———— (1969) 'Semonides über die Frauen: Nachtrag zum Kommentar zu Fr. 7', *Mnemosyne* 22.3, 299-301.

———— (1977) 'Epilegomena zu Semonides Fr. 7', *Mnemosyne* 30.1, 1-12.

Wachsmuth, K. and O. Hense (eds.) (1884-1912) *Ioannis Stobaei Anthologium* (4 vols.), Berlin. [Repr. 1974, index 1923.]

Welcker, F. Th. (1835) 'Simonidis Amorgini: Jambi qui supersunt', *RhM* 3, 353-438.

West, M. L. (ed.) (1966) *Hesiod: Theogony*, Oxford.

——— (ed.) (1972, 1989-92²) *Iambi et elegi graeci ante alexandrum cantati*, Oxford.

[Repr. 1998.]

——— (1974) *Studies in Greek elegy and iambus*, Berlin and New York.

Wilhelm, A. (1949) 'Zu Semonides von Amorgos', *Symbolae Osloenses* 27.1, 40-53.

Wilkins, J. (2000) *The boastful chef: the discourse of food in ancient Greek comedy*, Oxford.

Williams, F. (2010) 'Monkey business in Semonides (fr. 7.75)', in F. Cairns and M. Griffin (eds.) *Papers of the Langford Latin seminar, fourteenth volume: health and sickness in ancient Rome; Greek and Roman poetry and historiography. ARCA 50*, Cambridge, 119-131.

Wilson, A. M. (1977) 'The individualized chorus in Old Comedy', *CQ* 27.2, 278-283.