

Archilochus and the oral tradition

Autor(en): **Page, Denys**

Objektyp: **Article**

Zeitschrift: **Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique**

Band (Jahr): **10 (1964)**

PDF erstellt am: **12.07.2024**

Persistenter Link: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-660620>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Inhalten der Zeitschriften. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern.

Die auf der Plattform e-periodica veröffentlichten Dokumente stehen für nicht-kommerzielle Zwecke in Lehre und Forschung sowie für die private Nutzung frei zur Verfügung. Einzelne Dateien oder Ausdrucke aus diesem Angebot können zusammen mit diesen Nutzungsbedingungen und den korrekten Herkunftsbezeichnungen weitergegeben werden.

Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. Die systematische Speicherung von Teilen des elektronischen Angebots auf anderen Servern bedarf ebenfalls des schriftlichen Einverständnisses der Rechteinhaber.

Haftungsausschluss

Alle Angaben erfolgen ohne Gewähr für Vollständigkeit oder Richtigkeit. Es wird keine Haftung übernommen für Schäden durch die Verwendung von Informationen aus diesem Online-Angebot oder durch das Fehlen von Informationen. Dies gilt auch für Inhalte Dritter, die über dieses Angebot zugänglich sind.

IV

DENYS PAGE

Archilochus and the Oral Tradition

ARCHILOCHUS AND THE ORAL TRADITION

THE introduction of the alphabet to Greece led directly to the greatest change ever made in the technique of literary composition. The principal characteristic of the pre-alphabetic method is dependence on a traditional stock of memorised formulas which, however flexible and receptive of additions and modifications, dictate in large measure not only the form but also the matter of poetry. The use of writing enabled the poet to make the word, rather than the phrase, the unit of composition; it assisted him to express ideas and describe events outside the traditional range; it gave him time to prepare his work in advance of publication, to pre-meditate more easily and at greater leisure what he should write, and to alter what he had written. The process of change was presumably gradual: but in the end poetry set itself more or less free from the restrictions imposed both upon matter and upon form by the traditional treasury of ready-made phrases.

The question whether Archilochus composed by the old or the new method or a mixture of both methods is fundamental to the understanding of the actual words and phrases we read in him. We cannot appreciate the meaning of his sentences until we have answered this question: is this word, or this phrase, selected because appropriate, or adopted because traditional? A superficial judgement may declare that the answer is obvious: the elegiac poems are a mixture of old and new, the cretic poems are almost wholly composed by the new method. The truth is by no means so facile.

I shall state a case presently for the opinion that the use of the alphabet in Greek lands precedes the lifetime of Archilochus by a very short interval. If this is admitted — and the evidence really compels us to admit it — it follows

that Archilochus himself must have been brought up in the traditional discipline, and must have had to adapt himself to the new one. We shall inquire how far it is possible to discern, in the scanty fragments of Archilochus, the conflict or blend of methods, the reactions of the one upon the other.

If we are to approach by this path, we must first say what we believe the two important dates may be, that of Archilochus' lifetime and that of the earliest use of the alphabet in Greek lands. The former I state without discussion, though not without prolonged consideration: the scanty and often ambiguous evidence of all sources, external and internal, indicates that Archilochus flourished in the middle of the seventh century B.C. Preciser definition seems to me impossible. He was probably born within a decade of 680 B.C.; some of his poetry was probably composed in the period 660-640 B.C. If these dates are too late, so much the better; they are certainly not too early.

The date of the first use of the alphabet in Greek lands has long been controversial; but the publication of Miss Jeffery's book, *The Local Scripts of Archaic Greece*, makes it possible at last to define the present state of the evidence and to draw the appropriate conclusions. The truth is that there are only seven or eight scraps of Greek writing which have any good claim to a date earlier than 700 B.C., and only one of these may be so early as 725 B.C. The number with a good claim to a date between 700 and 675 B.C. is not more than a dozen. That is, in brief, the surprising and significant result of a century's researches.

The absolute dates of these scraps of writing remain quite uncertain. Criteria are inadequate, and the margin of error is wide. It is only the broad outline that is clearly defined. If we state that alphabetic writing was very rare in any Greek land before the birth of Archilochus, we are not likely to be contradicted by future discoveries. If the same statement had been made nearly one hundred years ago,

when the Dipylon Oenochoe was found, it would still remain uncontroverted today, although in the meantime many scores of thousands of pots and sherds and stones and statues and wall-faces have been discovered and examined; they have yielded only some twenty inscriptions (or groups of inscriptions) which may be earlier than c. 675 B.C.; not one, except the Dipylon Oenochoe (if indeed it really is an exception)¹, has any serious claim to a date earlier than c. 710 B.C. This is the lesson of a hundred years of increasingly extensive archaeological exploration: that the alphabet was not in common use anywhere until the lifetime of Archilochus; and indeed we have no right whatever to believe that the use was common even then.

The following extracts from Miss Jeffery's book will serve to show how few and how small are the scraps of evidence for the use of the alphabet in the generation preceding the birth of Archilochus:—

A. Dated not later than 700 B.C.

- (i) The Dipylon Oenochoe: c. 725?
Attica 1; pp. 68 f., with Plate 1:

ἄος νυν ὀρχεστον παντων ἀταλοτατα παιζει

- (ii) Sub-Geometric cup from Rhodes: as early as any inscription which we have, except the Dipylon Oenochoe.

Rhodes 1; p. 347, with Plate 67:

Φορακο ημι Φυλιχσ

- (iii) Stone from the Athenian acropolis: before 700.
Attica 2; p. 69, with Plate 1:

¹ The vase is generally dated about 730 B.C. or a little later: the inscription may have been added somewhat later (the lettering would be antique enough, if Attic; but it is not demonstrably Attic. MISS JEFFERY, *op. cit.*, p. 68-9).

]ενκεκαλ[
α]νφτοεροινε[(sic)

- (iv) Scyphos from Ischia: c. 700?
Pithecoussa 1; pp. 235 f., with Plate 47:

Νεστορος: ε[.]ι: ευποτ[ον]: ποτεριο[ν:]
λος δ' α<ν> τοδε π[ιε]σι: ποτερι[ον]: αυτικα κενον
λιμερ[ος: λαιρ]εσει: καλλιστε[φα]νο: Αφροδιτες

- (v) Oenochoe from Ithaca: not much, if at all, later
than 700.
Ithaca 1; p. 230, with Plate 45:

]μαλιστα Φον[
ξ]ενΦος τε φιλος και π[ιστο]ς εταιρος
]ιλαενπ[c. 14]οιτενατ[

- (vi) Clay votive plaque from Aegina: shortly before
700.
Aegina 1; p. 110, with Plate 16:

]σονοσεπιστ[

- (vii) Geometric sherd from Calymna: before 700.
Calymna 43, 44; p. 354, with Plate 69.

43 is described as « graffiti on both sides of a sherd »
described as « geometric ». They might be Greek letters
written singly for practice; or, as the editor suggests, they
might be Carian graffiti. 44 may as well be Carian as
Greek.

- (viii) Graffiti on vases from Gordium: « last quarter
of the 8th century ».

R. Young, *AJA* 62 (1958), 153, with Plate.

It seems very unlikely that these inscrutable scraps will
ever be dateable within a decade.

B. Dated early in the seventh century (c. 700-680 B.C.)

- (i) Sherds from Hymettus: a few may be « early 7th century ».

Attica 3 a-c; pp. 69 f., with Plate 1:

3 a].εμαδρο[.]. [...]ταφιλειτε[

3 b .[.].δεμοσ.[.] ... δεσ καταπυγων λεο[...].δεσ ερι[

3 c αβγ

- (ii) Rock-face inscriptions at Thera: « may well be as early as the graffiti on the sherds from Hymettus ».

Thera 1; pp. 318 f., with Plate 61:

- 1 a (i) ναι τον Δελπηνιον ε Κριμων τεδε οιπθε παιδα
-
- Βαθυκλεος αδελπθεο[ν

(Attempts have been made to create a trochaic tetrameter out of this).

1 a (ii) Θαρηε Ανασικλης

1 b (i) Ξευς

1 b (ii) Βορειαιος

- (iii) The Mantiklos statuette: c. 700-675?

Boeotia 1; p. 90 with Plate 7:

Μαντικλος μ ανεθεκε Γεκαβολοι αργυροτοχοι
τας δεκατας τυ δε Φοιβε διδοι χαρι.Φετταν αμοιβ[αν

- (iv) Theban
- lebes*
- : c. 700-675?

Boeotia 2 a; p. 91, with Plate 7;

επι εκπροποι

- (v) Abecedarium on a proto-Corinthian oenochoe from Cyme: c. 700-675?

Corinth 2; p. 125, with Plate 18.

- (vi) Pyxis from Syracuse: 700-675?
Corinth 3; p. 125, with Plate 18:

]παρε.[/]ανκλασε.[

- (vii) Abecedarium on ivory tablet from Marsigliana
d'Albegna: c. 700-650?
Euboic Colonies 18; pp. 236 f. with Plate 18.

- (viii) Sub-Geometric cup from the Argive Heraion:
c. 700-675?
Tiryns 11; p. 149, with Plate 25:

χοσημι

- (ix) Gravestone at Anaphe: early 7th cent.

Αγϙυλιον τονδε τον θοϙον εποιε

C. Among the numerous inscriptions which cannot be dated more precisely than « 7th century », few have any special claim to a place in the first quarter of that century. The following deserve mention:

- (i) Boeotian lebetes: c. 700-600?
Boeotia 3 a-c; p. 91, with Plate 7.
- (ii) Rock-inscription at Amorgos: not later than the first half of the 7th century.
Amorgos 1; p. 293, with Plate 56:

Δηδαμανι Πυγμας ο πατερ [τ]ονδ οιϙ[ον

The dates of the following are too controversial to be used in evidence:

(a) Sherds from Corinth; Corinth 1, p. 120 f., with Plate 18; dated in the 8th century by the excavator, late 6th century by Rhys Carpenter. Miss Jeffery's date, c. 700, is one

« from which the epigraphist may ultimately climb down on one side or the other ».

(b) Obeli from Perachora; Corinth 7, pp. 122 ff., with Plate 18; c. 650 according to Miss Jeffery, whereas earlier writers had gone as far back as c. 750. A sherd from Perachora, Corinth 5, is dated c. 675? (Λυγονος).

I take no account here of the inscription on a stele at Paros, Paros 27, p. 294, with n. 3: whether this is metrical or not, it falls far outside our present boundaries (c. 600-550).

If the discoverer of the Dipylon Oenochoe in 1871 had predicted that a century of extensive research would reveal no earlier specimen of the Greek alphabet, and only some twenty scraps representing the following fifty years, he would have been thought a rash prophet; so indeed he would have been, yet his prediction would have been wholly fulfilled.

The technique of composition had been of the ready-made formula type for many generations; and we suppose that the earliest use of the alphabet was simply to record what had been composed by the traditional method. All the earliest dactylic inscriptions are indeed of the traditional type, composed in ready-made formulas (see Notopoulos, *Hesperia* 29 (1960), 195 f.). We shall now look at Archilochus without prejudice, and inquire, first, how far his elegiac poems are composed in the traditional style. The volume of evidence is small, and we must restrict our question to the following formulation: granted that the subject-matter may be actual, not legendary or otherwise fictitious, is there anything either in language or in thought which is not more or less immediately supplied by the Epic tradition? We know that we cannot answer even this limited question absolutely: what survives from the Epic tradition is only part of a much larger whole. We shall follow the road so far as it goes; and we shall find that it goes far enough.

Fr. 7D.

κῆδεα μὲν στονόεντα, Περικλεες, οὔτε τις ἀστῶν
 μεμφόμενος θαλίηις τέρψεται οὐδὲ πόλις·
 τοίους γὰρ κατὰ κῦμα πολυφλοίσβοιο θαλάσσης
 ἔκλυσεν, οἰδαλέους δ' ἀμφ' ὀδύνηισ' ἔχομεν
 πνεύμονας. ἀλλὰ θεοὶ γὰρ ἀνήκεστοισι κακοῖσιν,
 ὦ φίλ', ἐπὶ κρατερὴν τλημοσύνην ἔθεσαν
 φάρμακον· ἄλλοτε δ' ἄλλος ἔχει τάδε· νῦν μὲν ἐς ἡμέας
 ἐτράπεθ', αἱματόεν δ' ἔλκος ἀναστένομεν,
 ἐξαῦτις δ' ἐτέρους ἐπαμείψεται. ἀλλὰ τάχιστα
 τλῆτε γυναικεῖον πένθος ἀπωσάμενοι.

It is immediately obvious that the phrasing is traditional from beginning to end. κῆδεα ... στονόεντα is an Epic formula (*Od.* 9. 12). The verb μέμφομαι, absent from Homer, occurs in Hesiod (*Op.* 184). θαλίηις τέρψεται recalls τέρπεται ἐν θαλίηις (*Od.* 11. 603; cf. Hes. *Op.* 115 τέρποντ' ἐν θαλίηισι). τοίους γὰρ... is a common formula at the beginning of the line (the vernacular would say τοιοῦτος οἱ τοιοῦδε; *Od.* 4. 826, 11. 549, 556). κατὰ κῦμα πολυφλοίσβοιο θαλάσσης comes ready-made from the Epic (*H. Ven.* 4; without κατὰ, *Il.* 2. 209, 6. 347). κῦμα ... ἔκλυσεν is at home in this company (cf. *H. Ap.* 74 f. κῦμα ... κλύσσει). The phrase which follows is new to us, and may be the poet's invention, « *we have our lungs swollen through sorrows* »; but it is merely a variation on a common theme, exemplified in *Il.* 9. 553 χόλος .. οἰδάνει ἐν στήθεσσι, 646 οἰδάνεται κραδίη χόλωι. The transition from « heart swelling with rage » to « lungs swelling with grief » is such as might have been made at any time; Archilochus is doing what was constantly done during the creative period of the Epic — adapting an old formula, creating a new one. The usage of ἀμφί is Homeric. ἀνήκεστοισι κακοῖσιν is nothing new (Hes. *Tb.* 612); ὦ φίλε in this position is a formula used ten times in the *Odyssey*; κρατερὴν τλημο-

σύννην is a new combination, suitable to the pentameter verse; the adjective is common in Homer, and the noun suits the style (*H. Ap.* 190 f.). φάρμακον is a common Epic word, not to be regarded as metaphorical here; ἄλλοτε ἄλλος ἔχει τάδε recalls Homer in thought and phrase (*Od.* 4. 236 f. ἄλλοτε ἄλλωι / Ζεὺς ἀγαθόν τε κακόν τε διδοῖ, *Il.* 15. 684 ἄλλοτ' ἐπ' ἄλλον ἀμείβεται). νῦν μὲν ... ἐξαῦτις δὲ ... has formula quality (*Il.* 7. 29, 290, 8. 141 νῦν μὲν ... ὕστερον αὔτε ...). ἐτράπετο occurs in the same position in *Il.* 16. 594. αἱματόεν δ' ἔλκος ἀναστένομεν is an adaptation of traditional formulas: αἱματόεν ἔλκος is akin to συμῶδιζ αἱματόεσσα, *Il.* 2. 267, and ἔλκος ἀναστένομεν is an adaptation of such a phrase as μῆνιν ἀναστενάχων, *Il.* 19. 77 (*Mass.* and *Chia*). ἐξαῦτις begins the line as here often in Homer. ἐπαμείψεται recurs in the same position in *Il.* 6. 230 (ἐπαμείψομεν). ἀλλὰ τάχιστα occupies the same position in *Il.* 21. 466. γυναικεῖον is Homeric (*Od.* 11. 437). πένθος ἀπώσαμενοι is an adaptation of a formula (*Il.* 12. 276 νεῖκος ἀπώσαμενους, *H. Cer.* 276 γῆρας ἀπώσαμένη).

All this is obvious and tedious to narrate. Yet it needed stating in full, if only because the commentators (and the worst offender is the Teubner edition) distort the picture by quoting Homeric parallels haphazard. They imply that the phraseology of Archilochus is about half traditional, half his own; and that is a serious error. The composition here is wholly of the traditional type; it consists of nothing but Epic phrases adapted to the present theme.

Our second observation is perhaps more surprising and certainly more important. Not only is the language wholly traditional or traditional-adapted: the sentiments are also supplied ready-made by the Epic. The idea expressed in the first couplet, that «city and citizens are alike affected» is familiar to us from *Il.* 3. 50 μέγα πῆμα πόλῃι τε παντί τε δήμωι, 24. 706 χάρμα πόλει τ' ἦν παντί τε δήμωι. The sentiment in the third couplet was a commonplace in the

Epic tradition, cf. *Il.* 24. 49 τλητὸν γὰρ Μοῖραι θυμὸν θέσαν ἀνθρώποισι. The following reflection, ἄλλοτε ἄλλος ἔχει τάδε, differs only in fulness of expression from *Od.* 4. 236 f. ἄλλοτε ἄλλωι / Ζεὺς ἀγαθὸν τε κακὸν τε διδοῖ; it is a traditional theme, expanded further by Archilochus in *Fr.* 58D. (= 56Bgk.). The final appeal, «to put aside unmanly grief», is another commonplace; and the implication of the epithet γυναικεῖον, «that only women sit at home and weep», would be quite at home in the Epic, cf. *Il.* 2. 289 «like children or widowed women they mourn to each other».

Traditional also is the structure of the whole: statement of a theme (1-4) is followed by philosophic-consolatory maxims (5-9), ending in exhortation (9-10). This pattern is exactly the same as that in *Il.* 12. 310 ff.: statement of the present case (310-321), followed by philosophic reflection (322-7), ending in exhortation (328).

The general conclusion must be plainly stated: in structure, in sentiment, and in phrasing these lines are wholly within the limits of the traditional oral Epic. The facts that the subject-matter is actual and that the metre has taken a new form make no difference whatsoever either to the matter or to the manner of what is said. The whole could stand, in just these words and phrases, in a speech by a person in the *Iliad*.

The importance of the inquiry becomes at once manifest when we look at such lines as the following:—

Fr. 5A D.

φρα[

ξεινοί[

δειπνον δου[

οὐτ' ἐμοὶ ὡς αἰ[

ἀλλ' ἄγε σὺν κώθωνι θοῆς διὰ σέλματα νηός

φοίτα καὶ κοίλων πώματ' ἀφελκε κάδων,

ἄγρει δ' οἶνον ἐρυθρὸν ἀπὸ τρυγός· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἡμεῖς

νήφειν ἐν φυλακῇι τῆιδε δυνησόμεθα.

The poet and his companions are at sea on a troublesome mission. They are on watch, ἐν φυλακῆι, presumably against enemy forces; but Archilochus sees no reason to stay sober, somebody is to go through the vessel and break open the wine-casks. A personal experience is being described in detail; but the question whether we can understand the detail depends largely on our judgement of the style. Is the phrasing selected because appropriate, or adopted because traditional? Or is it partly the one and partly the other? And if there is an element of selection, is it different in quality or quantity from that which is quite commonly a component of the oral Epic style?

Part of the answer is immediately given: the phrase οἶνον ἐρυθρόν is a ready-made formula, a convenient metrical unit; it is adopted because traditional, not selected because significant. Observe now also the line above, where the ancient technique of formula-making is being adapted to the creation of a ready-made pentameter. κοίλων ... κάδων is not a formula-phrase, but it may very well become one. The epithet « hollow » is added not because it is specially appropriate here, but for the contrary reason — because it is *not* specially appropriate. It is likely to suit many contexts; it may be used again and again; here is a small but characteristic example of the formula-making process applied to the special requirements of the pentameter.

If these two phrases are conventional, so may others be. We must frankly confess that we have no idea what Archilochus meant us to understand by the phrase θοῆς διὰ σέλματα νηός / φοίτα. We do not know whether the ship is in motion or at anchor: the epithet « swift » may be used of a ship at rest in Archilochus as in Homer. Nor can we tell whether there was any point in the mention of the « benches », σέλματα: θοῆς διὰ σέλματα νηός may be (we do not know whether it is or not) merely a metrically convenient alternative for θοὴν διὰ νῆα. Finally, we cannot tell whether

φοίτα means « go to and fro repeatedly » or simply « go »: φοιτᾶν is a common line-beginner in Homer; if it was adopted because traditional here, not even Archilochus' own audience could have known which meaning was intended.

The formula-technique of oral verse-composition encourages the making of new phrases, and readily admits the selection of individual words suitable to a particular context. Whereas the style of these lines in general is plainly that of the oral Epic, it is likely that a touch of new colour is to be recognized in the choice of the word κώθων. According to Critias (*Lac. Pol.*, ap. Athen. 483 a-b) a κώθων was a kind of cup ἐπιτηδειότατον εἰς στρατείαν: soldiers on campaign must often drink impure water, and the κώθων had a rim which held back the larger impurities (cf. also Theopompus *Fr.* 54. 1 κώθωνος ἐκ στρεψαύχενος). It may well be that Archilochus is describing the particular cup used on this occasion, and calls it a κώθων because it was indeed a κώθων and not some other sort of cup. Doubtless he would not have hesitated to call it by some other name if it had been convenient to his metre to do so; but it happened that the phrase σὺν κώθωνι fitted very well, indeed it has obvious formula-quality of its own.

I conclude with a comment on the imperatives ἄγρει and ἄφελκε. Neither is (so far as we know) traditional. ἀφέλκειν is not found in the Epic; ἄγρει and ἄγρεῖτε are always followed by another imperative, as in *Il.* 14. 271 ἄγρει νῦν μοι ὄμοσον. But what was the point of choosing such violent words? — « *Wrench off the lids of the casks, seize the red wine from the lees* »? It is likely that these are selected words; they add colour to the picture of carousal — « Let us *attack* the casks and *grab* as much as we can get ».

In summary, the most important lesson to be learnt from this small fragment is the need for caution before passing judgement. Part of the phrasing is certainly traditional, ready-made; all of it may be. We have identified one or two

apparent touches of new colour, and we notice that several words make their first appearance here (ἀφέλκειν, κάδος, κώθων, νήφειν, σέλμα, τρυγός); but there is nothing which the Epic might not have admitted at need. If a similar episode had occurred in the *Odyssey* (as well it might), it could have been described in just these words so far as metre permits. There is nothing to suggest that the technique of composition is different from that of the oral Epic.

Fr. 3D.

οὐ τοι πόλλ' ἐπὶ τόξα τανύσσεται οὐδὲ θαμειαί
 σφενδόναί, εὔτ' ἂν δὴ μῶλον Ἄρης συνάγηι
 ἐν πεδίωι, ξιφέων δὲ πολύστονον ἔσσεται ἔργον·
 ταύτης γὰρ κείνοι δαίμονές εἰσι μάχης
 δεσπότηι Εὐβοίης δουρίκλυτοι.

The contrast between theme and language here is absolute: the theme is contemporary, the language is wholly traditional.

οὐ τοι is a common line-beginner in Homer (*Il.* 2. 361, 6. 325, *al.*). τανύειν is normal Epic for bow-stringing (with τόξον as here *Od.* 21. 254 f.). The form τανύσσεται, like ἔσσεται below, is taken from the tradition. θαμειαί ends the line in *Il.* 1. 52, 12. 44, 287. σφενδόνη begins the line in *Il.* 13. 600. εὔτ' ἂν is common in Homer. μῶλον Ἄρης συνάγηι is purely Epic phrasing, an adaptation of the formulas μῶλον Ἄρης, ἔριδα ξυνάγοντες Ἄρης, ἵνα ξυνάγωμεν Ἄρηα. μῶλος has no existence outside the Epic and its imitators. ἐν πεδίωι at the beginning of the line in this sort of context is traditional (*Il.* 2. 473, 18. 256): there is no reason to suppose that a particular plain (for example, the Lelantine) is indicated; most battles took place on plains, and the force of tradition might compel Archilochus to say ἐν πεδίωι here even if he had no particular plain (or indeed place of any sort) in mind. πολύ-

στονον is a traditional epithet: πολύστονον ἔργον recalls Hes. *Op.* 145 οἷσιν Ἄρηος / ἔργ' ἔμελε στονόεντα, and the Homeric ἔργον Ἄρηος, πολέμοιο ... ἔργον. δαίμονές εἰσι μάχης is obviously an adaptation of *Il.* 5. 634 μάχης ἀδαήμονι 13. 811 οὔτοι τι μάχης ἀδαήμονες. δεσπότηαι is new, but the *Odyssey* had already admitted δέσποινα and δεσπόσυνος. δουρίκλυτοι in this position is traditional and, if correct (I think ἄορι κλυτοί likelier), owes its inclusion solely to the force of tradition; it is quite out of harmony with the stress on the sword as the weapon of these Lords of Euboea.

In summary, there is not the slightest sign of anything novel in the technique of composition, except the adaptation of traditional phrases to the needs of the pentameter. Nothing but the metre distinguishes these lines from any five average lines of the *Iliad*.

Fr. 6D.

ἀσπίδι μὲν Σαΐων τις ἀγάλλεται, ἦν παρὰ θάμνωι
 ἔντος ἀμώμητον κάλλιπον οὐκ ἐθέλων·
 αὐτὸς δ' ἐξέφυγον θανάτου τέλος· } ἀσπίς ἐκείνη
 ψυχὴν δ' ἐξεσάωσα. τί μοι μέλει; }
 ἔρρέτω· ἐξαῦτις κτήσομαι οὐ κακίω.

The theme is (or seems) modern, but there is no attempt to express the matter in any but the commonest traditional terms. There is no trace of the contemporary in the phrasing, except the use of a traditional epithet, ἀμώμητον, in a significant manner.

All the words are Homeric. ἀγάλλεται in this position is traditional (*Il.* 17. 473, 18. 132). The noun θάμνος is not common outside the Epic. ἔντος is a specifically Epic word (albeit in the plural; Archilochus alone has the singular, here and *P. Oxy.* 2313 *Fr.* 5. 5). κάλλιπον is an Epic form. οὐκ ἐθέλων is an Epic formula (*Il.* 4. 300, 23, 88, cf. *Il.* 18. 434 *al.*). One of the two versions of

the third line recalls the Epic phrases ἐκφυγέειν θάνατον (*Il.* 21. 66) and τέλος θανάτου (*Il.* 3. 309, *Od.* 5. 326, Hes. *Op.* 166); the other offers ἐξεσάωσα, an Epic form, in the same position as at *Il.* 4. 12. For the word ψυχή in similar Homeric contexts compare *Il.* 16. 505, 13. 763, *al.* ἐρρέτω begins the line in *Il.* 9. 377. ἐξαῦτις occupies the same position more than once in the *Odyssey*. κτάομαι and κακίων are both Epic words.

The poet neither intends nor achieves any special effect by the contrast between contemporary theme and traditional phrasing. He composes in this manner because he has no choice; his technique is wholly that of the oral Epic.

Fr. 2D.

ἐν δορὶ μὲν μοι μᾶζα μεμαγμένη, ἐν δορὶ δ' οἶνος
Ἴσμαρικός, πίνω δ' ἐν δορὶ κεκλιμένος.

Again the theme is (or appears to be) personal and contemporary, yet there is nothing that could not be said in the same or similar terms by a Hector to a Paris.

The anaphora of the phrase ἐν δορὶ is of a traditional type: cf. *Il.* 17. 430 f. πολλὰ μὲν ἄρ μάστιγι θοῆι ἐπεμαίετο θείων, / πολλὰ δὲ μελιχίοισι προσηύδα, πολλὰ δ' ἄρειῆι. Plainly traditional is the phrase ἐν δορὶ κεκλιμένος (cf. *Il.* 3. 135 ἄσπίσι κεκλιμένοι, *Od.* 6. 307 κίονι κεκλιμένη). Ἴσμαρικός, here signifying a choice vintage, recalls a wine celebrated in the *Odyssey*. μᾶζα μεμαγμένη may be new to literature, but is wholly in harmony with the Epic style: μᾶζα is a word dignified enough for Aeschylus, and μεμαγμένη helps to create a phrase of potential formula-quality.

Fr. 1D.

εἶμι δ' ἐγὼ θεράπων μὲν Ἐνυαλίῳ ἄνακτος
καὶ Μουσέων ἐρατὸν δῶρον ἐπιστάμενος.

The theme is indeed a novelty. In the Epic, a man may be as good in speech as in action (*Il.* 9. 443), and a great warrior might pass the time singing a song (*Il.* 9. 189); but it is inconceivable that the same man should be both soldier and poet. The poet is δημοεργός, like a doctor or a carpenter, and there is no bridge over the gulf between a Phemius and an Ajax. A social revolution is epitomised in this couplet: yet the language remains as traditional as anything in Homer.

θεράπων is a conventional word for the relation of the soldier to the War-god (θεράποντες Ἄρηος) and of the poet to the Muses (*H. Hymn.* 32. 20 αἰδοί / Μουσάων θεράποντες, *Margites* 1 Μουσάων θεράπων, Hes. *Tb.* 99). Ἐνυαλίοιο ἄνακτος is a traditional formula (Hes. *Scut.* 371); the genitive in — οιο and the operative digamma come to Archilochus from the Epic. ἐρατόν is a traditional epithet for δῶρον, which is metaphorical as here in *Il.* 3. 64, Hes. *Tb.* 103. ἐπίσταμαι is a traditional verb in such contexts.

Fr. 12D.

πολλὰ δ' εὐπλοκάμου πολιῆς ἄλδος ἐν πελάγεσσι
θεσσάμενοι γλυκερὸν νόστον.

εὐπλόκαμος is a traditional epithet, retaining its traditional prosody. πολιῆς ἄλδος is a common formula. ἄλδος ἐν πελάγεσσι recurs in *Od.* 5. 335 and *H. Hymn.* 33.15 (where λευκῆς, for πολιῆς, was a lapse of memory). θεσσάμενοι is an Epic verb (Hes. *Fr.* 201Rz²). γλυκερός is a traditional epithet for νόστος (*Od.* 22. 323).

Fr. 10D., 1-2.

εἰ κείνου κεφαλὴν καὶ χάριεντα μέλεα
Ἕφαιστος καθαροῖσιν ἐν εἵμασιν ἀμφεπονθήθη

The composition is wholly in the Epic manner. χαρίεν is a traditional epithet for bodily charm or grace. καθαρόν has a formular attachment to εἶμα (*Od.* 4. 750, *al.*). ἀμφεπονήθη is a traditional line-ending (*Il.* 23. 681, *Od.* 20. 307).

Fr. 11D.

κρύπτωμεν δ' ἀνιηρὰ Ποσειδάωνος ἄνακτος
δῶρα

The Epic style is unmistakable, although the prosody of ἀνιηρός is new. Ποσειδάωνος ἄνακτος recurs in *Il.* 20. 67 (the basic formula allowed for the operation of digamma). The ironical tone of δῶρα recalls that of ξείνιον in *Od.* 9. 356.

Fr. 10D., 3-4.

οὔτε τι γὰρ κλαίων ἰήσομαι οὔτε κάκιον
θήσω τερπωλὰς καὶ θαλίας ἐφέπων.

The words are all attested (albeit some of them seldom) in the Epic: κακίων is confined to the *Odyssey* (with the prosody κακῖ-), unless the variant is accepted in *Il.* 9. 601. τερπωλή recurs in *Od.* 18. 37, θαλίαι in *Od.* 11. 603 (singular in *Il.* 9. 143, 285). There is nothing here that could not be said in these words by a Homeric hero.

Fr. 13D.

Γλαῦκ', ἐπίκουρος ἀνὴρ τόσον φίλος ἔσκε μάχηται.

There may well be some novelty in the meaning of ἐπίκουρος, if indeed it stands for something like «mercenary» here. The absence of ἔσκε from the Epic may be fortuitous; it could have been used at need, just as e.g. ἡνίκα was found convenient on a single occasion.

Fr. 4D.

ξείνια δυσμενέσιν λυγρὰ χαριζόμενοι.

This line is wholly in the language of the Epic.

Fr. 9D.

Αἰσιμίδη, δήμου μὲν ἐπίρρησιν μελεδαίνων
οὐδεὶς ἂν μάλα πόλλ' ἱμερόεντα πάθοι.

The words ἐπίρρησις and μελεδαίνω, though not attested in the Epic, are quite in harmony with its language: ῥῆσις occurs in *Od.* 21. 291, μελεδαίνω keeps company with μελεδών, μελέδημα; the combination ἐπίρρησιν μελεδαίνων makes a potentially useful formula. The phraseology of the second line is readily supplied by tradition: *Od.* 13, 91 μάλα πολλὰ πάθ' ἄλγεα, 2. 174 κακὰ πολλὰ παθόντα, *Il.* 9. 492 μάλα πολλὰ πάθον. ἱμερόεντα is a traditional epithet, its usage here an easy extension of the normal.

Nor is there anything un-Homeric in the sentiment. An Epic hero might well say « You will not be happier for paying close attention to the reproaches of the *Demos*»; Achilles himself means much the same thing when he says that he will pay no heed either to the King or to « the rest of the Greeks », for he gets no good or pleasure from doing his duty in the field (*Il.* 9. 315 ff.).

Fr. 15D.

σुकέη πετραίη πολλὰς βόσκουσα κορώνας
εὐήθης ξείνων δέκτρια Πασιφίλη.

This couplet sounds quite different from everything else in the elegiac remains of Archilochus. It rings allusive, compact, clever, the sort of thing we admire without surprise in the more gifted Hellenistic epigrammatists. It is surely

the work of a studious composer, pen in hand. συκέη πετραίη is intended to remind us of *Od.* 12. 231 Σκύλλην πετραίην, in the manner of a deliberate literary allusion; πολλάς βόσκουσα recalls the same context, *Od.* 12. 127 πολλαί/βόσκοντο. δέκτρια is a bold invention, not to be found again before the Christian era. If we look for a more evident hall-mark of forgery, I suggest that we find it in the word εὐήθης: whether it means « simple » or « good-natured », there is no other evidence that this adjective existed in the world until two hundred years after the lifetime of Archilochus.

The general conclusion is clear and certain. The elegiac remains of Archilochus conform to the pre-alphabetic technique of verse-composition. The characteristics of that technique are as strongly marked in him as in the *Odyssey*, more strongly than in Hesiod's *Works and Days*. The whole consists of traditional phrases, adaptations of such phrases, creation of new phrases of similar type, and a few selected words: examine any average passage of Homer forty lines long, and these are the elements which you will find. Actuality of theme makes no difference either to the vocabulary or to the style. There is hardly anything which could not be transferred to a legendary context of the Epic type. Even the sentiments are often rather dictated by tradition than inspired by the contemporary emotion or event. We have not yet seen any trace of the influence of the use of the alphabet on literary composition.

So much being established, let us see what happens when dactylic are mixed with non-dactylic types of metre. We observe immediately that the formular language of the Epic prevails here also. We notice with particular interest that the formular language of the Epic spills over from the dactylic to the non-dactylic elements, spreads uniformly over both, and becomes the principal formative influence upon the style of the non-dactylic elements. The style thus formed

prevails also, though not exclusively, in those *Epydica* which lack the dactylic element.

I. *Asynarteta*

Fr. 112D.

τοῖος γὰρ φιλότητος ἔρωσ ὑπὸ καρδίην ἔλυσθεις
πολλὴν κατ' ἀχλὺν ὀμμάτων ἔχευεν
κλέψας ἐκ στηθέων ἀπαλάσ φρένας

The language is wholly traditional, a concatenation of Epic formulas adapted to the new metres; the traditional phraseology pervades the iambic as well as the dactylic element.

The beginning τοῖος γὰρ ... is an Epic formula. ὑπὸ καρδίην ἔλυσθεις is an adaptation of a formula now represented only by *Od.* 9. 433 ὑπὸ γαστέρ' ἔλυσθεις, *Nicias Anth. Pal.* 7. 200.1 ὑπὸ πλάκα κλῶνος ἔλυσθεις. ἔλυσθεις is a purely Epic verb. As Marzullo has observed (*Problemi di letteratura greca arcaica: Cultura e scuola* n. 5 (1962), 64-6) the line as a whole is in the spirit of *Hes. Scut.* 41: τοῖος γὰρ κραδίην πόθος αἴνυτο. κατ' ἀχλὺν ὀμμάτων ἔχευεν is an adaptation of *Il.* 5. 696, 16. 344 κατὰ δ' ὀφθαλμῶν κέχυτ' ἀχλὺς, 20. 321 κατ' ὀφθαλμῶν χέεν ἀχλὺν; in a similarly emotional context, *Il.* 20. 421 κάρ ῥά οἱ ὀφθαλμῶν κέχυτ' ἀχλὺς. The position of κατὰ between πολλὴν and ἀχλὺν is artificial and awkward. The form ἔχευεν is supplied by tradition. Metre compels the poet to say ὀμμάτων instead of ὀφθαλμῶν, the word more familiar to himself and to the tradition alike. κλέψας ἐκ ... begins the line in *H. Merc.* 340. The genitive plural of στηθεός is a form avoided by the older Epic (*Il.* 10. 94 f. only). κλέψας ... ἀπαλάσ φρένας recalls *Il.* 11. 115 ἀπαλόν τέ σφ' ἦτορ ἀπηύρα. The whole is reminiscent of *Il.* 14. 217, also an emotional context, ἔκλεψε νόον πύκα περ φρονεόντων.

Nor is there anything novel in the spirit or content of these lines: so might Zeus speak to Hera in a Διὸς Ἀπάτη, *Il.* 14. 315 f. οὐ γάρ πώ ποτέ μ' ὦδε θεᾶς ἔρος οὐδὲ γυναικὸς / θυμὸν ἐνὶ στήθεσσι περιπροχυθεὶς ἐδάμασσαν.

Once more we observe that actuality of theme (if indeed it is actual) makes no discernible difference either to the manner or to the matter of what is said.

Fr. 118D.

ἀλλά μ' ὁ λυσιμελής, ὦ ταῖρε, δάμναται πόθος.

The language is traditional. λυσιμελής is an Odyssean word, and λῦσε δὲ γυῖα is a common formula; λύτο γούνατα describes the effect of love in *Od.* 18. 212, and λυσιμελής is applied to Eros in Hes. *Th.* 121. δάμναται in a similar context is familiar from *Il.* 14. 199, 316, *H. Ven.* 17. πόθος is known to the *Odyssey* and to the late Epic, not to the *Iliad*. This line is simply a transference of Odyssean language and thought to a different metre.

Fr. 113D.

οὐκέθ' ὁμῶς θάλλεις ἀπαλὸν χροῶ, κάρφεται γὰρ ἤδη.

The line is in the style of *Od.* 13. 398, κάρψω μὲν χροῶ καλόν. ἀπαλός in Homer commonly describes parts of the body; ἀπαλόχρους occurs in Hes. *Op.* 519, cf. *H. Ven.* 14.

Fr. 116D.

καὶ βήσσας ὀρέων δυσπαιπάλος οἶος ἦν ἐπ' ἥβης.

βήσσας ὀρέων is supplied by tradition: οὔρεος ἐν βήσσησι *Il.* 3. 34, *al.*; cf. Hes. *Op.* 510, *Th.* 860, 865, *Scut.* 386; *H. Merc.* 287. δυσπαιπάλος is an adaptation of the formula ὄρεος ... παιπαλόεντος (*Il.* 13. 17); cf. *Il.* 17. 743 ἐξ ὄρεος κατὰ παιπαλόεσσαν ἀταρπὸν, Megacleides in *Od.* 6. 106 δρία παιπαλόεντα.

Fr. 107D.

Ἐρασμονίδη Χαρίλαε, χρῆμά τοι γελοῖον
 ἔρέω, πολὺ φίλταθ' ἑταίρων, τέρψεται δ' ἀκούων.

There is nothing untraditional in the vocabulary except the use of χρῆμα. The phrasing is plainly Homeric: πολὺ φίλταθ' ἑταίρων occurs in *Od.* 24. 517, φίλταθ' ἑταίρων more than once (*Il.* 13. 249, 19. 315); the address Ἐρασμονίδη Χαρίλαε is in the Epic style; τέρψεται δ' ἀκούων recalls *Od.* 12. 52 τερπόμενος ὅπ' ἀκούησις, 15. 393 τερψομένοισιν ἀκούειν, *Il.* 1. 474 φρένα τέρπετ' ἀκούων.

Fr. 114D.

ὄγμος, κακοῦ δὲ γήραος καθαιρεῖ.

All the words are Homeric. If ὄγμος is metaphorical, it takes its place in the brief list of Homeric words first used in this way by Archilochus.

Fr. 115D.

πολλάς δὲ τυφλάς ἐγγέλυας ἐδέξω.

All the words are Homeric (τυφλός *Il.* 6. 139 only; ἐγγελυς, 21. 203). We do not know the theme, and have no reason to suppose that the same matter might not be expressed in the same words, adapted to his own metre, by an Epic poet.

Fr. 108D.

φιλέειν στυγνόν περ ἑόντα μηδὲ διαλέγεσθαι.

περ ἑόντα is an Epic formula, the adjective στυγνός is (probably by chance) not attested earlier.

Fr. 110D.

Δήμητρι τε χειῖρας ἀνέξων.

Traditional phraseology; *Il.* 6. 257 Διὶ χειῖρας ἀνασχεῖν, 3. 318, 6. 301, 24. 301, *al.*

II. *Epodica*: (i) Alternate dactylic and iambic periods.

Fr. 104D.

δύστηνος ἔγκειμαι πόθωι
ἄψυχος χαλεπῆισι θεῶν ὀδύνηισιν ἔκητι
πεπαρμένος δι' ὀστέων.

The phrasing is an adaptation and extension of traditional formulas. δύστηνος is a common Homeric word. ἔκητι, always preceded by its noun, occurs thrice in the *Odyssey*, twice in the *Hymns*. Here again the adaptation of traditional phraseology spills over from the dactylic to the iambic element: χαλεπῆισι ... ὀδύνηισι ... / πεπαρμένος recalls *Il.* 5. 399 ὀδύνηισι πεπαρμένος, *H. Ap.* 92 ὠδίνεσσι πέπαρτο; nor is there anything new in δι' ὀστέων, cf. *Il.* 11. 97 δι' αὐτῆς ἦλθε καὶ ὀστέου. ὀδύνη is used of mental suffering in *Il.* 15. 25, *Od.* 1. 242, *al.* The phrase χαλεπῆισι ... ὀδύνηισι has a formular ring, though nothing closer is attested than *H. Ap.* 358 ὀδύνηισιν ἐρεχθομένη χαλεπῆισι.

There may be one or two small innovations: ἔγκειμαι with the dative occurs in Homer (*Il.* 22. 513), but in a different sense; and ἄψυχος is an unattested formation, here doing the work of the Epic ἀπὸ ψυχῆν ἐκάπυσσα (*Il.* 22. 467) and the like.

Fr. 81D.

ἔρέω τιν' ὑμῖν αἶνον, ὦ Κηρυκίδη,
†ἀχνυμένη σκυτάλη†
πίθηκος ἦιει θηρίων ἀποκριθείς
μοῦνος ἀν' ἐσχατιήν,
τῶι δ' ἄρ' ἀλώπηξ κερδαλέη συνήντετο
πυκνὸν ἔχουσα νόον.

The dactylic lines are adaptations of traditional formulas. ἀχνυμένη σκυτάλη (whatever it may mean) is an echo of *Il.* 24. 584 ἀχνυμένηι κραδίηι. μοῦνος is a traditional line-beginner, and ἀν' ἐσχατιήν is a formula (*Od.* 24. 150 ἐπ' ἐσχατιήν, cf. 2. 391, 9. 182, 10. 96, Hes. *Th.* 622 ἐπ' ἐσχατιῆι). πυκνὸν ἔχουσα νόον has obvious formula-quality, and is closely related to such phrases as πυκινὸν νόον (*Il.* 15. 461), πυκινὰ φρεσὶ μήδε' ἔχοντες (*Il.* 24. 282).

The influence of the traditional language is equally strong on two of the three iambic lines. ἐρέω ... αἶνον is conventional (Hes. *Op.* 202 αἶνον ... ἐρέω). In the fifth line, τῷ δ' ἄρα is non-vernacular, an adaptation of the traditional line-beginner τῷ δ' ἄρα. κερδαλέη is Epic (though not exclusively). συνήντετο is purely traditional, an Epic form confined hereafter to the high poetic style. The whole of this line is simply an adaptation of dactylic to iambic verse, the model being e.g. τῷ δ' ἄρα < — ∪ ∪ — ∪ > συνήντετο κερδαλέοφρων.

Finally, we observe the third line with special interest: it is the first example we have seen of new-coined phraseology, owing nothing to tradition.

(ii) Wholly iambic.

Fr. 88D.

πάτερ Λυκάμβα, ποῖον ἐφράσω τόδε;
 τίς σὰς παρήειρε φρένας
 ἦις τὸ πρὶν ἠιρήρεισθα; νῦν δὲ δὴ πολὺς
 ἀστοῖσι φαίνεαι γέλως.

There is nothing untraditional in the vocabulary, and the phrasing reveals the influence of the Epic at two points: ποῖον ἐφράσω τόδε is an echo of a common formula, ποῖον ἔειπες, ποῖον τὸν μῦθον ἔειπες, and the phrase φρένας ἦις τὸ πρὶν ἠιρήρεισθα is an adaptation of the Epic

φρεσὶν ἤισιν ἀρηρώς (*Od.* 10. 553) and similar expressions. Homeric colour in the iambic lines of *Epodica* is further shown by λαίψηρά in 92 *b* D., 87. Bgk., 3, and doubtless (though the adjective is not attested earlier) by αἰηνές in 90 D.; cf. δολοφρονέουσα in 86. 2 D. The only modern note is sounded by the usage of πολὺς γέλως.

Fr. 95D.

ὄρκον δ' ἐνοσφίσθης μέγαν
ἄλας τε καὶ τράπεζαν.

Both the phrase μέγας ὄρκος and the usage of νοσφίζομαι are traditional. The words are simply an adaptation to iambic verse of the dactylic ἐνοσφίσθης μέγαν ὄρκον, ἄλας ἠδὲ τράπεζαν.

Fr. 94D.

ὦ Ζεῦ, πάτερ Ζεῦ, σὸν μὲν οὐρανοῦ κράτος,
σὺ δ' ἔργ' ἐπ' ἀνθρώπων ὄραϊς
λεωργὰ καὶ θεμιστά, σοὶ δὲ θηρίων
ὑβρις τε καὶ δίκη μέλει.

The influence of the Epic is very strong. Ζεῦ πάτερ is a traditional line-beginning, and κράτος is commonly used of the power of Zeus. The second line recalls *Od.* 13. 213 Ζεὺς ... / ἀνθρώπους ἐφορᾷ. θεμιστά has cognates in the Epic. λεωργά is new. The last line reflects traditional phraseology: *Od.* 17. 485 ff. θεοὶ ... / ἀνθρώπων ὑβριν τε καὶ εὐνομίην ἐφορῶντες, *Hes. Op.* 238 οἷς ὑβρις τε μέμηλε ... / τοῖς δὲ δίκην Κρονίδης τεκμαίρεται.

Fr. 92a D.

ὄραϊς ἔν' ἐστ' ἐκεῖνος ὑψηλὸς πάγος
τρηχὺς τε καὶ παλίγκοτος;
ἐν τῷι κάθημαι σὴν ἐλαφρίζων μάχην.

Both in vocabulary and in phrasing these lines are independent of the extant Epic; yet they are wholly in harmony with its style, and the lack of prototypes may well be fortuitous.

Fr. 102 D.

ἦ δέ οἱ σάθη
 ὄση τ' ὄνου Πριηνέος
 κήλωνος ἐπλήμυρεν ὄτρυγηφάγου.

Here at last is an example of composition far removed from the traditional in content, in vocabulary, and in style. The unit here is not the phrase but the carefully selected word — σάθη, Πριηνεύς, κήλων, πλημύρω, ὄτρυγηφάγος. This is the poetry of free invention, pen in hand. It is entirely different in that respect from anything else we have seen so far except perhaps a line or two.

The facts so far established are as follows:—

(1) The elegiac remains of Archilochus are composed almost wholly in the traditional language of the oral Epic; there is no indication that the use of writing has affected the technique of composition.

(2) Where dactylic and iambic metres are mixed, the traditional language predominates in both components.

(3) The traditional language predominates also in those *Epodica* which include no dactylic component. The influence of the Epic remains often paramount, and is seldom absent for long. There remain however isolated patches in which the unit is the carefully selected word, independent of the traditional language. We shall see more of this kind of composition in the iambic trimeters and trochaic tetrameters; before we turn to them, I comment briefly on one or two aspects of the cretic types of verse in the early period.

It is an easy and, I believe, a common assumption that the iambic and trochaic poems of Archilochus were com-

posed with the aid of writing. We shall make no such assumption, but shall follow the facts so far as they lead us. We shall recognize the possibility that the tradition which Archilochus inherited was one of oral composition, not only for dactylic but also for the cretic types of verse. Certainty is unattainable, but there is some reason to believe that the composition of cretic verse is of higher antiquity than the use of the alphabet in Greece.

First, the cretic poems of Archilochus attain a high peak of technical excellence. There is nothing experimental, let alone primitive, in their composition. The language is well adapted, the style formed, the flow easy. The versification conforms to strict and subtle rules: hiatus, including *correptio epica*, is forbidden; a short vowel is always lengthened by the combination of mute and liquid consonants; a median caesura is obligatory; Porson's law, Maas' law, and other laws are strictly observed. Now the practice of using the art of writing as an aid to composition cannot have begun much if at all earlier than the birth of Archilochus, and it is not probable that these metres were invented and developed to this extent in a single generation. It may be worth while to add that complexity and severity of metrical rules are no indication of the use of writing: the Homeric hexameter itself conforms to a code of elaborate regulations. Such refinements are for the ear, not for the eye; they have nothing to do with pen and paper.

Secondly, verse of the cretic type, especially the iambic trimeter, was associated with the ritual of cults which are certainly older than the alphabet; it is likely that the association goes very far back into the past. Moreover, the iambic trimeter is a common vehicle for popular proverbs and maxims; and this also is likely to be a very old practice.

Thirdly, verse of this type is attested almost as soon as writing appears in Greek lands. The inscription on the Ischia vase prefixes a clumsy trimeter to its elegant

hexameters; and we shall now consider what lesson may be learnt from the *Margites*.

It was the opinion of the ancients, recorded from Plato and Aristotle onwards, that the *Margites* was a poem of extreme antiquity. It was indeed a work of Homer, earlier (they believed) than Archilochus; though we must wait till the twelfth century A.D. for evidence that Archilochus himself made mention of it. If Plato and Aristotle were anywhere near the truth, the *Margites* must have been composed about the time when the alphabet was coming into use, if not earlier. We should suppose that it was an oral composition; and the extant fragments do nothing to contradict us:—

The dactylic hexameters of the *Margites* are of the traditional type, composed mainly of ready-made formulas:

Fr. I, 1-2 θεῖος ἀοιδός is a common phrase; so is ἐκηβόλου Ἀπόλλωνος. For Μουσάων θεράπων see p. 134 above.

Fr. II is less conventional in vocabulary, but would pass without comment in the *Odyssey*.

P. Oxy. 2309 1, χειρὶ δὲ μακρῆι has obvious formula-quality. 2, καὶ ῥα is traditional, so is the line-ending ἔλασεν (for the hiatus cf. *Il.* 24. 349). 7, ἐφράσσατο μῆτιν recalls *Il.* 17, 634, 712 φραζώμεθα μῆτιν, *Od.* 4. 529 ἐφράσσατο τέχνην. 8, λιπών in this position is traditional (*Il.* 4. 181, 9. 194, 17. 612, *al.*), so is δέμνια. 9, ἐκ δ' ἔδραμεν ἔξω recalls *Il.* 5. 599 ἀνά τ' ἔδραμ' ὀπίσσω, 14. 413 περὶ δ' ἔδραμε πάντηι. 10 and 12, διὰ νύκτα μέλαιναν occurs in *Il.* 10. 297, 394, 24. 653. 16, χειρὶ παχείηι is a common formula.

The influence of the Epic is almost equally strong on the iambic lines; as in Archilochus, so also here, they take their colour from the dactyls with which they are associated:

Fr. I, 3, φίλην ἔχων ἐν χερσὶν εὐφθογγον λύρην, a line of high poetic phrase and tone. ἔχων ἐν χερσὶν is a ready-made phrase, *Il.* 1. 14.

About the iambs in *P. Oxy.* 2309 Mr. Lobel writes, « the trimeters are in the dialect and of the metrical type used by the Ionic iambic writers, and the vocabulary recalls Hipponax»; a judgement which I find it difficult to accept. There are indeed only some fourteen words preserved, and they are scattered over eight lines:

P. Oxy. 2309 3, *πόνοισιν εἶχετο* is in harmony with the Epic style, cf. *Od.* 17. 318 *ἔχεται κακότητι*, 20. 200 *κακῶς ἔχεται*. 5, *ἐξελεῖν δ' ἀμήχανον* might come direct from an Epic model, *ἐξελέειν γὰρ ἀμήχανον*. 14, *δύστηνον κάρα* is in the high poetic style. The introduction of a couple of vulgar words, *ἀμῖς* and *ὀμιχέω*, is as much in the manner of Archilochus as of Hipponax; the precedent was already set by Hesiod, *Op.* 727.

The quantity of evidence is very small. So far as it goes, it is consistent with the natural supposition that the same dialect and style prevailed in both metrical components. There is obviously no need to postulate the use of writing for the dactylic lines; the iambic evidence is so scanty that it is prudent to admit that we cannot judge one way or the other.

Let us now return to Archilochus, and consider first the lines in iambic metre.

P. Oxy. 2310, *Fr.* 1, col. i:

[traces of seven lines]

].μειβομ[..

γύνα[ι], φάτιν μὲν τὴν πρὸς ἀνθρώπω[ν
 μὴ τετραμήνης μηδέν· ἀμφιδευ...[
 10 ἔμοι μελήσει. [θ]υμὸν ἔλ[α]ον τίθει·
 ἔς τοῦτο δὴ τοι τῆς ἀνολβείης δοκ[έω
 ἤκειν; ἀνήρ τοι δειλὸς ἄρ' ἐφαινόμην,
 οὐ]δ' οἶός εἰμ' ἐγὼ [α]ὐτὸς οὐδ' οἶων ἄπο.
 ἐπ]ίσταμαί τοι τὸν φιλ[έο]ν[τα] μὲν φ[ι]λέειν,

- 15 τὸν <δ'> ἐχθρὸν ἐχθαίρειν τε [κα]ὶ κακο[
 μύ]ρμηξ λόγῳ .. υντ[.....]θείη πάρα·
 πό]λιν δε ταύτη[ν..] . [...έ]πιστρε[φ..] . [
 ..].οι ποτ' ἄνδρες ἐξ.[.....]σαν, σὺ δ[έ
 .].ν εἶλες αἰχμῆι κ.[....]ξηρα[...].εος
- 20 κείνης ἀνασσε καὶ .[....]. ἴην ἔχε.
 π.[.].[.].[.].η[.].η. ωτος ἀ[νθρ]ώπων ἔσεαι.
]νηὶ σὺν σ[μ]ικρῆι μέγαν
]ας ἦλθες ἐκ Γορτυνίης
]..ο....π.εστάθη
- 25]αι τόδ' ἀρπαλ[ί]ζομ[
].γυης ἀφικ[
].μοισινε.[.....].ς
]χεῖρα καὶ π[.]εστ[.]θη
]ο.σας φ[ο]ρτίων δέ μοι με[.]...
- 30]ος εἶτ' ἀπώλετο
]νε.α μηχανή
]λ.ς οὔτιν' εὐροίμην ἐγώ
]. κῦμ' ἄλδος κατέκλυσεν
]ν χερσὶν αἰχμητέων ὑπο
- 35 ἥ]βην ἀγλ[α]ήν ἀπ[ώ]λεσ[α]ς
]θεῖ καὶ σε θε[ὸς ἐρ]ρύσατο
][.]. κάμῃ μουνωθέντ' ἴδῃ
]ν ἐν ζόφῳ δὲ κείμενο<ς>
]έ[ς] φά[ος κ]ατεστάθη
- 40]ς·
]τις ἀνθρώπου φυή
 ἀλλ' ἄλλος ἄλλῳ καρδίην ἰαίν[ε]τα[ι
]..τ..με..σα[...]. σάθη
]ε βουκόλῳ φαλ[.].ωι
- 45]ος μάντις ἀλλ' ἐγὼπέσοι
]γάρ μοι Ζεὺς πατήρ Ὀλυμπίων
 ἔ]θηκε κάγαθὸν μετ' ἀνδράσι
]δ' ἂν Εὐρύμας διη.ετο[

Every word except τετραμαίνω and ἀρπαλίζομαι is shared with Homer or Hesiod (the commonly accepted supplements would add a few more); and the phrasing is often an adaptation of traditional formulas to the iambic metre. 8, φάτιν ... ἀνθρώπων, cf. *Od.* 21. 323 φάτιν ἀνδρῶν. 10, θυμόν ἔλαον τίθει, cf. *Il.* 9. 639 ἔλαον ἔνθεο θυμόν. 22, νηὶ σὺν: σὺν νηὶ is common in the Epic. 33, κῦμ' ἀλὸς κατέκλυσεν, cf. p. 126 above. 34, χερσὶν αἰχμητέων ὑπο, cf. *Il.* 19. 62 δυσμενέων ὑπὸ χερσίν, 11. 827 χερσὶν ὑπο Τρώων, 15. 289, *al.* 35, ἦβην ἀγλαὴν ἀπώλεσας, cf. *IG*, I, suppl. 446 a ἀπώλεσαν ἀγλαὸν ἦβην, Simo-nides 105 ἀγλαὸν ὤλεσαν ἦβην. 36, σὲ θεὸς ἐρρύσατο, cf. *Il.* 15. 290 τις αὖτε θεῶν ἐρρύσατο, 20. 194 ἀτάρ σε Ζεὺς ἐρρύσατο. 42, cf. *Od.* 14. 228 ἄλλος γάρ τ' ἄλλοισιν ἀνὴρ ἐπιτέρπεται ἔργοις, 4. 548 κραδίη ... ἰάνθη, *H. Cer.* 65 κραδίην ... ἔηνα. 45-7, ἔθηκε καὶ γαθὸν μετ' ἀνδράσι, cf. *Il.* 13. 461 ἐσθλὸν ἐόντα μετ' ἀνδράσιν, *Od.* 15. 252 μάντιν ... θῆκε.

The traditional language is not being used or adapted for special effect; it is structural, not ornamental. Such poetry is to a considerable extent a transference of Epic formulas to a new metre. Modern words and idioms are quite freely woven in, but it is the Epic which sets the tone, and the blend is harmonious.

It is now known that this fundamental fact about the style of Archilochus was appreciated by literary critics in the third century B.C. *P. Hibeh* 173 is a fragment of a work in which the debt of Archilochus to Homer was illustrated in a series of line-by-line comparisons:

P. Hibeh 173. 4, χραίσμησε δ' οὔτεπ[: cf. *Il.* 14. 66 τεῖχος δ' οὐ χραίσμησε, *al.*; and observe that Archilochus adopts the unaugmented form of the verb. 8 ἐμοὶ τόθ' ἦδε γῆ χάνοι: cf. *Il.* 4. 182, 8. 150 τότε μοι χάνοι εὐρεῖα χθῶν. 12 κοῦδεις δ' ἔπειτα σὺν θεοῖ[σ' ἄψει μάχην: cf. *Il.* 5. 130 μή τι σύ γ' ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖς ἀντικρὺ μάχεσθαι.

Evidently it was possible to illustrate at appreciable length the principle that the language of Archilochus in the iambic poems consists largely of Homeric phrases adapted to the new metre.

Fr. 22D.

οὐ μοι τὰ Γύγεω τοῦ πολυχρύσου μέλει
οὐδ' εἶλε πῶ με ζῆλος οὐδ' ἀγαιομαι
θεῶν ἔργα, μεγάλης δ' οὐκ ἔρέω τυραννίδος·
ἀπόπροθεν γάρ ἐστιν ὀφθαλμῶν ἐμῶν.

There is some innovation both in vocabulary (ζῆλος, τυραννίς) and in syntax (τὰ Γύγεω is not an Epic idiom), but the influence of the traditional language is evident in the choice of the epithet πολυχρύσου (of a person, *Il.* 10. 315, cf. *H. Ven.* 9) and in the phrase οὐδ' ἀγαιομαι θεῶν ἔργα, which is adapted from Epic formulas, cf. *Od.* 20. 16 ἀγαιομένου κακὰ ἔργα, *Il.* 16. 120 ἔργα θεῶν. Here as usual we observe, first, that the language is obviously not vernacular; secondly, that its literary source is primarily the traditional Epic.

The remaining iambs tell a similar tale. They are either very brief (none longer than two lines) or very fragmentary; but the Epic influence is often strong and manifest:

Fr. 25D., 3-4.

ἦ δέ οἱ κόμη
ὤμους κατεσκιάζε καὶ μετάφρενα.

The phrase ὤμους ... καὶ μετάφρενα comes directly from an Epic formula, *Il.* 2. 265, *Od.* 8. 528 μετάφρενον ἠδὲ καὶ ὤμους. μετάφρενον is an Epic word, rare in prose and later poetry; plural, though of one person, also in *Il.* 12. 428. The verb κατασκιάζω occurs in *Od.* 12. 436.

Fr. 18D.

ὕλης ἀγρίης ἐπιστεφής.

ἐπιστεφής is an Epic word, very rare in later poetry; metaphorical as here in *Il.* 8. 232, *Od.* 2. 431 (the only Homeric examples), κρητῆρας ἐπιστεφέας οἴνοιο.

Fr. 29D.

Ζεῦ πάτερ, γάμον μὲν οὐκ ἔδαισάμην.

The phrasing is traditional: Ζεῦ πάτερ is an Epic line-beginning; for the rest, cf. *Il.* 19. 299 δάσειν γάμον, *Od.* 4. 3 δαινύντα γάμον, *H. Ven.* 141 δαίνυ γάμον.

Fr. 31D.

παῖδ' Ἄρεω μαιφόνου.

μαιφόνος is a purely Epic word: *Il.* 5. 844, 21. 402 Ἄρης ... μαιφόνος, 5. 31, 455 Ἄρες ... μαιφόνε. παῖδ' Ἄρεω probably means «warlike man», not strictly «son of Ares», cf. υἷες Ἄρηος, ὄζος Ἄρηος.

Fr. 32D.

κατ' οἶκον ἐστρωφᾶτο μισητὸς βάβαξ.

κατ' οἶκον ἐστρωφᾶτο is an adaptation of the Epic phrase κατὰ μέγαρα στρωφᾶσθαι (*Il.* 9. 463). The word βάβαξ recurs only in Lycophron, and we have no means of judging its quality.

Fr. 36D.

φιληῖτα νύκτωρ περὶ πόλιν πωλεύμενε.

An adaptation of Epic phraseology to the iambic metre: *H. Merc.* 66 f. οἶά τε φῶτες / φηληται διέπουσι μελαίνης νυκτὸς ἐν ὄρηι.

Fr. 38D.

ἐτήτυμον γὰρ ξυνὸς ἀνθρώποις Ἄρης.

Cf. *Il.* 18. 309 ξυνὸς Ἐνυάλιος.

Fr. 49D.

πέτρης ἐπὶ προβλήτος ἀπτερούσσετο.

Cf. *Il.* 16. 407 πέτρῃ ἐπὶ προβλήτι, *H. Hymn.* 7. 3 ἀκτῆι ἐπὶ προβλήτι.

Fr. 35D.

τοῖον γὰρ αὐλήν ἔρκος ἀμφιδέδρομεν.

Again the phrasing is literary, not vernacular, and the Epic tradition is the model: τοῖον ... γὰρ is a common formula; for the rest, cf. *Il.* 9. 476 ἐρκίον αὐλῆς, *Od.* 14. 5 ff. αὐλή ... περίδρομος.

The dignity of the transplanted Epic style is very seldom lowered by the innovations in vocabulary and phrase. It is fully preserved in those fragments which seem more or less remote from the influence of Epic formulas, and which indicate that free and careful choice of words which distinguishes written from oral composition:

Fr. 21D.

ψυχὰς ἔχοντες κυμάτων ἐν ἀγκάλαις.

The sense of ψυχῆ is modern; the imagery is new; the spirit and style are quite unlike the Epic. This line would be at home in an Attic Tragedy.

Fr. 25D., 1-2.

ἔχουσα θαλλὸν μωρσίνης ἐτέρπετο
 ῥοδῆς τε καλὸν ἄνθος.

The words are carefully selected to describe the contemporary scene.

Fr. 18D., 3-4.

οὐ γάρ τι καλὸς χῶρος οὐδ' ἐφίμερος
οὐδ' ἐρατὸς οἶος ἀμφὶ Σίριος ῥόας.

Tradition has little to do with the phrasing here.

Fr. 26D.

ἔσφυρισμένας κόμας
καὶ στῆθος ὡς ἂν καὶ γέρων ἠράσσατο.

Again the words are carefully selected to describe the contemporary scene. The Epic colour in ἠράσσατο (*Il.* 20. 223, *Od.* 11. 238) blends perfectly with the tone of the rest.

Fr. 28D.

ὥσπερ αὐλῶι βρῦτον ἢ Θρέιξ ἀνήρ
ἢ Φρύξ †ἔβρυζε† κύβδα δὴν πονευμένη,

The obscenity is expressed in highly poetical terms, with a touch of traditional colour in the phrase ἢ Θρέιξ ἀνήρ / ἢ Φρύξ, cf. *Il.* 3. 401 ἢ Φρυγίης ἢ Μηονίης, 6. 457 Μεσσηίδος ἢ Ὑπερείης.

I suspect that the construction ἦν πονευμένη would be an anachronism, and therefore interpret ΔΗΝ as δὴν, not δ' ἦν.

Fr. 33D.

πρὸς τοῖχον ἐκλίνθησαν ἐν παλινσκίωι.

Another example of new phraseology carefully chosen to describe the contemporary scene.

Fr. 37D.

κύψαντες ὕβριν ἀθρόην ἀπέφλοσαν.

The phrasing here seems quite independent of the Epic tradition.

Fr. 43D.

ἴσθη κατ' ἠκὴν κύματός τε κἀνέμου.

Another vivid creation, modern in phrase.

The picture seems clear enough. The formular language of the traditional Epic is the strongest formative element in the style of the iambics. Epic formulas almost unchanged, Epic formulas ingeniously adapted to the new metre, isolated Epic words and forms, all contribute largely to the making of the new literary language. And the Homeric colour pervades the innovations. Archilochus quite freely introduces new images and new vocabulary, but there is no conflict of styles or even imperfection of blend; the innovations are raised to the level of the predominant Homeric style.

There is no doubt that the phraseology is sometimes independent of the traditional models. A new literary language is in process of formation; still under the influence of the Epic, but slowly attaining a measure of independence. And in those places where the unit of composition is plainly the word, freely and carefully chosen for its aptness and accuracy, I suppose that Archilochus is beginning to take advantage of the assistance that writing may give to composition. The change of technique was presumably gradual, on a small scale at first, experimental, subordinate to the inherited technique of purely mental composition.

The Trochaic Tetrameters

The story is the same. In many lines the influence of Epic formulas is obviously paramount. Some of the follow-

ing simply transplant the phraseology of the Epic into the new metre:

Fr. 75D.

κλυθ' ἀναξ "Ἡφαιστε καί μοι σύμμαχος γουνουμένωι
ἔλαος γένευ, χαρίζεο δ' οἶά περ χαρίζεαι.

Wholly traditional, apart from the word σύμμαχος: κλυθι ἀναξ *Il.* 16. 514, *Od.* 5. 445. γουνουμένωι as in *Il.* 15. 660, *Od.* 4. 433. With ἔλαος γένευ compare *Il.* 19. 178 σοί ... θυμός ... ἔλαος ἔστω. For the rest, cf. *Il.* 13. 633 (of Zeus) οἶον δὴ ἀνδρεσσι χαρίζεαι.

Fr. 65D.

οὐ γὰρ ἐσθλά κατθανοῦσι κερτομέειν ἐπ' ἀνδράσιν.

An adaptation, with the least possible change, of *Od.* 22. 412, οὐχ ὁσίη κταμένοιισιν ἐπ' ἀνδράσιν εὐχεταάσθαι. With the phrase οὐ γὰρ ἐσθλά ... compare *Il.* 24. 301 ἐσθλὸν γάρ ... (in the same sense; Archilochus uses the plural ἐσθλά merely to avoid coincidence of long syllable with word-end at the first *anceps*).

Fr. 57D.

καὶ νέους θάρσυνε· νίκης δ' ἐν θεοῖσι πείρατα.

An adaptation of the Homeric phrase νίκης πείρατ' ἔχονται ἐν ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσι (*Il.* 7. 102). θαρσύνειν is a traditional verb in such contexts. The line might be a trochaic version of a dactylic model, e.g. ἀλλὰ νέους θάρσυνε. θεοῖς δ' ἐνι πείρατα νίκης.

The longer fragments offer a better perspective. The influence of the Epic tradition is more obvious in some than in others; but let only so much as three or four lines be given complete, and it will never be wholly wanting. We see the

style gradually liberating itself from dependence on Homeric formulas; yet it preserves the colour which its earlier dependence on Homeric formulas had imparted to it. Quite often we observe an Epic word or phrase isolated amid modern surroundings, blending harmoniously with its context.

Fr. 56D.

Γλαῦκ', ὄρα, βαθύς γὰρ ἤδη κύμασιν ταρασσεται
πόντος, ἀμφὶ δ' ἄκρα Γύρεων ὀρθὸν ἵσταται νέφος,
σῆμα χειμῶνος, κιχάνει δ' ἐξ ἀελπτίης φόβος.

The phrasing is largely traditional-adapted. ταρασσεται πόντος recalls *Od.* 5. 291 ἐτάραξε δὲ πόντον. It is surprising, by the way, that κύμα has no formular connexion with πόντος in the Epic: there is no such phrase as κύματα πόντου, κύμασι πόντου. ὀρθὸν ἵσταται is conventional, cf. *Il.* 24. 359 ὀρθαί ... ἔσταν, *Od.* 18. 241 ὀρθὸς στῆναι, *al.* σῆμα χειμῶνος recalls *Il.* 17. 548 f. τέρας ... χειμῶνος. κιχάνειν comes to Archilochus from the Epic. On the other hand ὄρα is not so used in the older Epic (*H. Hymn.* 7. 26) βαθύς is seldom applied to the sea, never to the noun πόντος. The usage of φόβος, «fear», is absent from the older Epic.

Fr. 67 a D.

θυμέ, θύμ' ἀμηχάνοισι κήδεσιν κυκώμενε
†ἀναδυ† δυσμενέων δ' ἀλέξευ προσβαλὼν ἐναντίον
στέρνον † ἐν δοκοῖσιν ἐχθρῶν † πλησίον κατασταθείς
ἀσφαλέως καὶ μήτε νικῶν ἀμφάδην ἀγάλλεο
μηδὲ νικηθεὶς ἐν οἴκῳ καταπεσὼν ὀδύρεο,
ἀλλὰ χαρτοῖσιν τε χαῖρε καὶ κακοῖσιν ἀσχάλα
μὴ λίην, γίνωσκε δ' οἶος ῥυσμὸς ἀνθρώπους ἔχει.

An expansion of a traditional theme, *Od.* 20. 18 τέτλαθι δὴ κραδίη· καὶ κύντερον ἄλλο ποτ' ἔτλης. The

phrasing, though suitable both to the occasion and to the metre, is never for long out of contact with the Epic. 1 Cf. *Od.* 19. 377 ὀρώρεται ἔνδοθι θυμός / κήδεσιν. 2 ἀλέξευ ... ἐναντίον: cf. *Il.* 21. 539 ἀντίος ... ἀλάλκοι. 3 πλησίον κατασταθείς: cf. *Il.* 4. 329 πλησίον ἐστήκει. 4 ἀσφαλέως, «steadfastly», cf. *Il.* 17. 436 μένον ἀσφαλέως, *Od.* 17. 235 ἔμεν' ἀσφαλέως. 5 Cf. *Il.* 24. 549 ἄνσχεο μηδ' ἀλίσστον ὀδύρεο. 6 ἀσχαλάω is a traditional verb. 6-7 Cf. *Il.* 6. 486 μή μοί τι λίην ἀκαχίζεο. μή λίην is a formulaic phrase.

A hero in the Epic could express just these thoughts in the same or similar terms so far as metre permits.

Fr. 74D.

χρημάτων ἀελπτον οὐδέν ἐστιν οὐδ' ἀπώμοτον
 οὐδὲ θαυμασίον ἐπειδὴ Ζεὺς πατὴρ Ὀλυμπίων
 ἐκ μεσημβρίας ἔθηκε νύκτ' ἀποκρύψας φάος
 ἡλίου λάμποντος, ὑγρὸν δ' ἦλθ' ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους δέος.
 ἐκ δὲ τοῦ καὶ πιστὰ πάντα ἀπίελπτα γίνεται
 ἀνδράσιν. μηδεὶς ἔτ' ὑμέων εἰσορῶν θαυμαζέτω
 †μηδεῖνα† δελφῖσι θῆρες ἀνταμείψωνται νομόν
 ἐνάλιον καὶ σφιν θαλάσσης ἠχέεντα κύματα
 φίλτερ' ἠπείρου γένηται, τοῖσι δ' †ἦδὺ ἦι† ὄρος
]χηνακτίδης
]ητου πάις
]τύθη γάμω.[
]...νε..
]νέειν
]
 ἀν]δράσιν

The modern elements are quite numerous here: notably the use of *χρημάτων*, the genitive absolute in 4 (rare in the Epic, a late intruder), the theme of 6-9 (destined to remain a commonplace for a thousand years), the adjectives *ἀπώμοτον*

and θαυμάσιον (*H. Merc.* 443; θαυμαστός, -άσιος, -ατός are not in Homer), the noun μεσημβρία. One has the impression that the style of the cretic poems is beginning to set itself free from the control of its parent and guardian, the Epic tradition. Yet the tone throughout is not very different from that of Homer. There is one very obvious echo from the past in the phrase θαλάσσης ἠχέεντα κύματα (*Il.* 1. 157 θάλασσά τε ἠχέεσσα); and other phrases would blend easily with an Epic context if their wording was slightly re-arranged: καὶ δ' ὕγρον ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους δέος ἦλθε, μήτις ἔτ' εἰσορών θαυμαζέτω.

Fr. 50D.

οὐ φιλέω μέγαν στρατηγὸν οὐδὲ διαπεπλιγμένον
οὐδὲ βοστρύχοισι γαῦρον οὐδ' ὑπεξυρημένον,
ἀλλὰ μοι σμικρὸς τις εἶη καὶ περὶ κνήμας ἰδεῖν
ροϊκός, ἀσφαλέως βεβηκῶς ποσσί, καρδίης πλέως.

This is an extreme example of the same principle. The need to describe a particular aspect of the contemporary scene compels Archilochus to seek his phraseology outside the traditional patterns. Such words as διαπεπλιγμένον, ὑπεξυρημένον, ροϊκός, καρδίης πλέως are all freely chosen, descriptive of an individual. Yet here also the tone preserves the elevation which the new verse-form had acquired from contact with the Epic: βοστρύχοισι γαῦρον is a highly poetical phrase (cf. *Eur. Or.* 1532). περὶ κνήμας has a traditional ring; and it is characteristic of the style that the one purely Epic element should be quite unnoticeable — the form ποσσί, alien to Archilochus, comes to him from Homer, and it is likely enough that the whole phrase ἀσφαλέως βεβηκῶς ποσσί is the transplantation of an Epic formula, ποσσὶ βεβηκῶς / ἀσφαλέως. Compare *P. Oxy.* 2313. 5. 6, where the Homeric formula δοῦπον ἀκόντων reappears in the form ἀκόντων δοῦπον.

There is nothing novel in the theme itself. We are at once reminded of the *Iliad*'s description of Tydeus, μικρὸς μὲν ἔην δέμας, ἀλλὰ μαχητῆς. Such expansion of Homeric themes is highly characteristic of Archilochus: cf. the expansion of *Od.* 20. 18 in 67 a D.; of *Il.* 9. 236 in 7D., 9B. (vv. 7-9); *al.* Another Homeric model is seen in *Od.* 18. 3 f. (of Irus) οὐδέ οἱ ἦν ἕς / οὐδὲ βίη, εἶδος δὲ μάλα μέγας ἦν ὀράσθαι; cf. *Il.* 1. 225, where an impudent face is contrasted with a cowardly heart, — I take the phrase from Professor Snell, though I doubt if I can follow when he adds that «whereas appearance and merit are contrasted with one another... the inner qualities are not, as in Archilochus, played off against the surface impression». All that Archilochus says is implicit in such Homeric passages. The only novelty is the application of the traditional theme to a living instead of a legendary person. An Epic poet might himself have expanded the theme in much the same terms. I am not of course denying that there is a marked difference in spirit between Archilochus and Homer: but I am suggesting that it is not nearly so great as it is sometimes supposed to be. The one great difference is simply that Archilochus is speaking (very often) about personal experiences (his own or others'), whereas Homer is not. It is my contention that this difference has surprisingly little effect either on the form or on the matter of Archilochus' compositions.

There are numerous other passages which confirm our impression that Archilochus is seldom for long free from the influence of the traditional language of the Epic:

58D. 2, μελαίνῃ κειμένους ἐπὶ χθονί: μελαίνῃ is used here not because it is appropriate but because it is traditionally associated with «earth» (in Homer, always with γαῖα, never χθών). ὑπτίους κλίνουσ': cf. *Od.* 9. 371 ἀνακλινθεὶς πέσεν ὑπτίος. κακὰ πολλά is a common formula. 5 νόου παρήγορος: cf. *Il.* 23. 603 οὐ τι παρήγορος οὐδ' ἀεσίφρων.

Mar. Par. 51 I A D., 49 ξύν' ἐποίησαν κακά: cf. *Il.* 16. 262 ξυνὸν δὲ κακὸν πολέεσσι τιθεῖσιν. 57 παῖς ἐρικτύπου Διός; in the Epic style, with a new adjective in place of the traditional ἐρίγδουπος. 58 καρδίην ὠρινεν: cf. *Od.* 17. 216 ὄρινε δὲ κῆρ.

P. Oxy. 2313, 3 νηυσὶν θοῆισι: adaptation of a common formula.

68D., τοῖος ἀνθρώποισι κτλ.: cf. *Il.* 4. 289 τοῖος πᾶσιν θυμὸς ἐνὶ στήθεσσι γένοιτο, *Od.* 18. 136 f. τοῖος γὰρ νόος ἐστὶν ἐπιχθονίων ἀνθρώπων / οἶον ἐπ' ἡμαρ ἄγησι πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε.

78D.4 νόον τε καὶ φρένας: Hes. *Scut.* 149 νόον τε καὶ ... φρένας.

Add the use of the Homeric verb κροαίνω (176 Bgk.) and the distracted form Κρεήτη (175 Bgk.).

The high poetic tone inherited from the Epic is maintained almost uniformly throughout the fragments of Archilochus. Style does not vary with subject-matter. Whether the theme is Father Lycambes, adventure in Thasos or Thrace, Fox and Eagle, eclipse of the sun, personal or impersonal, descriptive or reflective, low or lofty, the style retains its elevation. It is always a blend of Homeric phrase with modern vocabulary. And the modern element is very seldom less dignified than the ancient: all but a dozen words recur, or might recur, in the highest poetry of later times. Some of Archilochus' poems were savagely satirical, not without obscenity; but there is no indication that these differed from the rest in elevation of style. Most of the few obscenities are in fact expressed in highly poetical terms: 34D. ἀλλ' ἀπερρώγασί μοι / μύκω τένοντες: an Epic poet could have said — probably did say — ἀπερρώγασι τένοντες. 138 Bgk. Ἴνας δὲ μεδέων ἀπέθρισεν: τοῦ δ' Ἴνας ἀπέθρισεν may well have been an Epic formula. The obscenity of 102D. is expressed in exquisite language; that of 28D. with a strong touch of Homeric colour.

In most of these passages what we observe is the inclusion of a single vulgar word in phraseology of the high poetic style.

Two further points on this aspect. First, there are remarkably few words of the sort that might recur in the Comedy but not in the Tragedy of Athens: I doubt if there are more than a dozen in all the extant fragments and testimonia (*ἀποσκαλύπτειν*, *ἀσκός*, *βινέω*, *βρῦτον*, *μέδεα*, *μύκης*, *μυσάχνη*, *πόρνη*, *πυγή*, *σάθη*, *τράμις*, and a few more doubtful). Secondly, earlier poetry had already set a precedent in this matter: the Epic style as modified by Hesiod quite freely admitted such words as *ὀμιχεῖν*, *πυγοστόλος*, *αἰδοῖα*. The dignity of the style was not debased merely by calling a spade a spade, and there is not yet a syllable of evidence to show that Archilochus made any break with tradition in this respect. The spirit is different, the style is not.

Pre-alphabetic poetry is composed largely by using or adapting ready-made formulas. We have seen that the traditional formula-language of the Homeric Epic is the principal formative element in the style of Archilochus' non-dactylic verse; and if we proceed to inquire whether his non-dactylic verse inherits or creates formulas of its own, designed to assist composition in this metre, the answer is plainly negative. There are very few repetitions of phrases suitable to the non-dactylic metres. The formula-element comes almost exclusively from the Epic, and the new style is formed by more or less extensive adaptation of traditional phrases combined with components, generally in moderate measure, of pre-meditated word-selection. In brief, the non-dactylic compositions of Archilochus reveal the transition from oral to written verse.

The change begins when the poet discovers that the use of the alphabet enables him to record his composition in advance of its recital. He still composes mentally and in the traditional language for the most part, but he can now

compose at leisure; he can meditate before recording his lines, and make changes after they have been recorded. He can give thought to the making of a new word, the polishing of an antithesis, the phrasing of a metaphor. He quickly learns that it is much easier to criticize and improve what you see than what you hear; and he soon becomes familiar with the independent and wayward genius that lurks in the pen-point, creator of phrases of which the mind was not conscious, and which the eye observes with surprise and with pleasure or the contrary. What we observe in Archilochus is not the result of the change but the transition to the change. Almost the whole of his dactylic verse and a large part of his *Asynarteta* and *Epodica* are composed in the traditional manner. But when the metres depart wholly from the dactylic, the language begins to move away from the traditional formulas; slowly at first, still deeply indebted to the traditional phrasing, still deeply dyed with the traditional colour; but unmistakably evolving a personality of its own.

On the transmission of the text

It is a natural and common assumption that the poems of Archilochus were recorded in writing in his own lifetime (first presumably by his own hand) and published thenceforward more or less widely throughout the Greek world in written form. The first part of this assumption may well be admitted; the second part is questionable. Oral transmission is equally possible, and is actually supported by evidence: the poems of Archilochus, like those of Homer, were recited by rhapsodes at public festivals in the sixth century B.C. (Heraclitus *Fr.* 42); and there is no need to postulate the existence of written copies to explain either the transmission or the wide circulation of the poems.

If the poems of Archilochus were indeed published in written form, what was that form? What was the material

on which they were written? It is very unlikely that papyrus was in common use in the lifetime of Archilochus or indeed for a generation or two beyond him. Miss Jeffery (*op. cit.* p. 57 f.) uses the evidence of the phrase ἀχνυμένη σκυτάλη to support the conclusion that «leather was the normal writing-material of the Greek scribe» in the time of Archilochus: I am quite unable to accept this, for we have no idea what is meant by ἀχνυμένη σκυτάλη, and no reason to suppose that it has any connexion with the practice of wrapping an inscribed roll of leather round a staff. Nevertheless, if the poems were circulated in written form, I am inclined to believe that leather strips or scrolls are the likeliest material, simply because there is no apparent alternative.

And now a final question. Archilochus was a well-known author in the fifth century B.C., especially at Athens. The text current in Athens must have been written in the contemporary Attic alphabet. What was its ancestry?

It seems inconceivable that an Athenian text could have been made by translating a written text from Parian into Attic script. The Parian alphabet has characteristics which would have been bewildering to an Athenian; especially the use of *omicron* for the long vowel and *omega* for the short one, the sickle-moon *beta*, the shapes of *gamma* (Λ) *lambda* (Γ) and *rho* (D). What might an Athenian make of ΦΩCΩΣ (= φόβος), ΛΑΔ (= γάρ), ΩΓΟΣ (= ὄλως), and a thousand other seeming-monsters? If you write out the fragments of Archilochus in the early Parian script, you will find no trace whatever of the sort of corruption which must have occurred if they had ever been translated out of Parian into Attic. Such error would have been avoidable if texts of Archilochus were made from dictation; and so I suppose they were, though we have no means of telling whether dictation means reading from a written text or reciting from memory.

DISCUSSION

M. Dover: I am worried about the whole question of formulae. Milman Parry was unquestionably right in his identification of the formulaic element in epic, but some of the conclusions drawn from his work have gone much too far. It does not follow, because a poet composes orally, that he composes only at the time of recitation; does he not premeditate what he is going to recite? And it does not follow that when a poet can write he composes only by means of writing. Like others here, no doubt, I have composed poems, but I have never written anything during the process of composition; I may have turned the poem over in my mind for several days, but I have not written it down until it was finished.

If, whenever we find a word or phrase common to epic and Archilochus, we are to say that it is an epic formula, we leave the Ionians dumb. Instead of saying that αἱματόεν ἔλκος is an «adaptation» of σμῶδιξ αἱματόεσσα, why not say simply: αἱματόεις was the Ionic for «bloody»? Again, how can anyone possibly say that τοῖος and νηῖ σὺν σμικρῇ were alien to the Ionic vernacular of the seventh century? We have no positive evidence whatever for that vernacular, and I plead for a confession of ignorance. The inferences which we can draw from fifth century prose are limited by the fact that the vocabulary of any dialect undergoes constant change. Now, about the material on which Archilochus may have written: I think it may be necessary to reconsider the question of the date at which papyrus became available to the Greeks.

M. Page: I agree that oral poetry may be pre-meditated, and no doubt usually was so in the Ionian period. Indeed I suppose that the Homeric poets often came to their recitations with the whole of their songs firmly fixed in the memory. They might then spontaneously modify what they had thus prepared, but I do not doubt that pre-meditation played a large part. Nevertheless,

the technique in this respect must have been enormously improved when the art of using writing as an aid to composition had been mastered.

On the question whether certain words which I attribute to the Epic tradition may nevertheless have been vernacular in the time of Archilochus, I submit that if you find a considerable number of words which are common to the Epic and Archilochus, but absent from all later Ionic and indeed all later Greek (except as borrowings from the Epic), than it is probable that a high proportion of such words came to Archilochus directly from the Epic, though it remains possible that some of them did indeed disappear from the vernacular between the seventh century and the fifth.

On the subject of papyrus as a writing-material, I can only repeat that I see no reason to believe that it existed as a common article of commerce in Greek lands before the development of trade with Egypt through Naukratis in the last quarter of the seventh century; I doubt if papyrus was at all common until much later than that.

M. Dover: I agree that the introduction of writing brings about a great change in society's attitude to poetry and in the poet's attitude to his own work; my only disagreement is with the sharp and decisive nature of the change postulated by Professor Page.

As for papyrus, I agree about the date of Naukratis; the only counter-argument — it has often been raised before — is that although the Greeks could not have obtained papyrus direct from Egypt before the opening-up of Egypt through Naukratis, they knew it by the name βύβλος.

I am delighted to hear that Professor Page has doubts about the relevance of the Yugoslav material. The prevalent American doctrine on this subject seems to me a form of Slavomania; it takes little account of the fact that the metrical form of Yugoslav oral poetry is extremely simple compared with Homer's, and its poetic quality is usually abysmal.

Material from other parts of the world could lead to different conclusions. It has been demonstrated, for example, that a Gaelic story-teller can reproduce a very long story verbatim after a lapse of many years. It is very important to remember that the implications of comparative material are not uniform in their tendency.

M. Tren: Mit Freuden hörte ich die Kritik an der « Slawomanie », auch vom Vortragenden, frage mich aber doch, ob in den Folgerungen über oral composition nicht etwas nachwirkt von Parry's Gleichsetzung von traditionell gleich bedeutungslos. Hierin halte ich es lieber mit Bowra: tradition and design. Ich muss etwas weiter ausholen. Man sagt heute: Homer schrieb. Oder man sagt: er konnte nicht schreiben. Oder aber, er konnte es anfangs nicht, lernte es aber, — und dann hat man (vgl. Kirk, *Cl. Q* 1960) den Gegenbeweis zur Hand, mit dem Erlernen des Schreibens verlerne jeder das Dichten, das er früher konnte, — ein « Beweis », noch bedenklicher als die These. Man beruft sich auf Parry, meist aber auf seine Publikationen aus jener Zeit, als er noch nicht nach Jugoslawien gegangen war; dass seine Skepsis später zunahm, wird oft ignoriert. Verse repetitions, schrieb Dodds in seinem schönen Rückblick (in *Fifty Years of Classical Scholarship*), seien ein Beweis für oral composition; wenige Seiten später fügt er hinzu, weitere Untersuchungen hierüber seien allerdings nötig. Sie sind es. Die serbo-kroatische Epik hat neben den Verswiederholungen bei typischen Szenen, neben wiederholten Formelversen — beides aus Homer ebenfalls bekannt — eine dritte Art von Verswiederholungen, die Homer nicht hat, näml. verdoppelte Verse, der zweite nur um eine kleine Hinzufügung erweitert, z.B. (das Zitat stimmt nur annähernd): « Alija beschloss, den Kopf von seinen Schultern nicht herzugeben ohne Kampf. Alija beschloss, den Kopf von seinen Schultern nicht herzugeben ohne harten Kampf ». Dieser Art von Verswiederholungen erkenne ich Beweiskraft zu, nur dieser, wenn ich dabei auch ein psychologisches — also vielleicht bedenkliches — Argument, ein momentanes Nichtwissen, wie das Lied weitergeht,

kaum umgehen kann. Aus alledem ersehen Sie meine Zurückhaltung in dieser Frage. Wie anders *Fr.* 102 D. ist als andere, mit epischen Wörtern durchsetzte Bruchstücke, wurde uns allen deutlicher als je zuvor; ob aber diese Andersartigkeit daher kommt, dass dies Lied geschrieben wurde vom Dichter, die anderen nicht, ob überhaupt — bei einem Dichter, der kein Alexandriner ist und nicht jahrelang herumfeilt (und bei kleinen compositions) — Schreiben oder Nichtschreiben das Ergebnis so fundamental beeinflusst, bleibt fraglich. Lieber lasse ich es dabei, dass Dichten ein Wunder ist. Ist denn der Einfluss der Schriftlichkeit in Hesiods *Theogonie* fassbar, wäre zu fragen: Hunderte von Namen, 3 Stemmata — geschieden, miteinander verknüpft, jedoch nichts durcheinandergebracht — namentlich der Anspruch auf Totalität sprechen m.E. für Schriftlichkeit.

Ein Weg, nicht ein Sprung führt von Homer zur Lyrik, und Hrn. Scherers neue Feststellung, dass Archilochos die Äolismen des Epos meidet, ist hier hinzuzufügen. Die « slight adaptations, » von denen Sie sprachen, dürfen besonderes Interesse beanspruchen. « Macht euren Sinn gross » bei Tyrtaios ist mit Recht stets als unhomerisch bezeichnet worden; dahin gehören zwei schon erwähnte (s.o. 156 und 148) Wendungen des Archilochos. ὀρθὸν ἴσταται νέφος (56 D.), ἐν ζόφῳ... κείμενος ἐς φάος κατεστάθην (Tr. p. 10 = *P. Oxy.* 2310) sind ganz unhomerisch.

M. Page: It is an interesting observation, that Archilochus, in his use of the Homeric language, tends to avoid these features of Homeric dialect which are non-Ionic. I would only comment, first, that it seems to me a very natural thing for a poet of his type to do; secondly, that he does not achieve consistency (there are some undoubted Aeolisms in the scanty fragments); and, thirdly, that I do not see here any reason for preferring written to oral composition.

It was characteristic of the Ionian Epic, that it replaced Aeolic by Ionian forms. Archilochus is no exception to the rule. It was a natural and instinctive process, and I find no problem in it.

Wenn die *Theogonie* ursprünglich geschrieben wurde, worauf wurde sie geschrieben? Sicher nicht damals auf Papyrus; und ich glaube nicht an Leder oder Holz als Schreibmaterial für derartige Gedichte. Auch sehe ich keine Notwendigkeit, die Schriftlichkeit gerade für diese Dichtungsart anzunehmen. Die Katalogdichtung ist uralt in Griechenland, sicher viel älter als die Einführung des Alphabets.

M. Treu: Ein genealogisches Epos besonderer Art ist die *Theogonie*, von anderen unterschieden durch den primären Anspruch auf Vollständigkeit. Ohne Schriftlichkeit gibt es keine gesicherte Vollständigkeit. Papyrus ist in mykenischen Gräbern einmal gefunden worden. Dass dieses Schreibmaterial den Griechen erst seit der Gründung von Naukratis 560 v. Chr. zugänglich geworden sei, war einst die Ansicht von F. A. Wolf: er war es auch schon, der Archilochos für den ersten Dichter hielt, der seine Gedichte niederschrieb. Ich scheue mich wie gesagt nicht, etwas weiter zu gehen als Wolf. Für Schriftlichkeit bei Archilochos sind übrigens die Liedreste auf dem unlängst gefundenen Stein aus dem Archilocheion ($E_2 = p. 50$ Tr.) ein neuer Beweis. Das Gedicht ist ja ein Hilferuf aus der Ferne, gerichtet an einen Abwesenden. Aber ist die Frage nach dem Schreibmaterial so ausschlaggebend?

M. Page: Wenn Archilochos einen Hilferuf an einen Abwesenden durch einen Vermittler schickt, so glaube ich, dass man nicht berechtigt ist, sich ohne Weiteres eine schriftliche Meldung vorzustellen. Sie kann ebensogut eine mündliche gewesen sein. Es war ja keine Mühe, ein Gedichtchen auswendig zu lernen, und das mündliche Berichten war damals vermutlich das Geläufige. Dieselbe Frage erhebt sich auch im Alkaios; dort aber kann man schon mit grösserer Zuversicht vom Schreiben reden, obwohl es auch nicht notwendig ist.

M. Treu: Ist ein Gedicht eine Botschaft, so ist es m.E. — bei Archilochos wie bei Alkaios — eine schriftliche. Andernfalls müsste der Bote das Gedicht erst auswendig lernen. Einfacher ist schriftliche Übermittlung.

M. Page: Was den Panslawismus betrifft, bin ich mit Professor Treu ganz einverstanden. Sehr interessant ist, was er über seine « dritte Art der Verswiederholung » gesagt hat. Ich habe mir bei Homer selbst ein Paar solcher Beispiele notiert, gebe aber zu, dass diese Erscheinung eine sehr seltene ist. Über die daraus zu ziehenden Schlussfolgerungen möchte ich κατὰ πλείω σχολήν nachdenken.

Übrigens möchte ich ausdrücklich betonen, dass es mir fern liegt, alles Originelle dem Archilochos abzusprechen. Ich versuche nur zu zeigen, dass die Abhängigkeit von der epischen Tradition sehr viel grösser ist, als man sie sich vorzustellen pflegt.

M. Snell: Es ist ausserordentlich aufschlussreich, dass Herr Page bis in die Einzelheiten hinein gezeigt hat, wie Archilochos gleichsam aus der homerischen Sprache heraus dichtet. Man muss aber hervorheben, dass er daneben auch wesentlich Neues und Eigenes bringt. Ich habe dafür gestern (s. oben, S. 113) schon Beispiele gegeben. Selbst in einem, wie wir eben gelernt haben, so « homerischen » Bruchstück wie *Fr. 75D.* taucht das Wort σύμμαχος auf. Dabei ist zu beachten, dass das nicht ein beliebiges neues Wort ist, sondern ein neuer Typus von Compositum mit συν -, in dem gemeinsames Handeln usw. bezeichnet wird. Auf bedeutsame Weise neu scheint mir auch in *Fr. 7,6D.* die Verbindung κρατερήν τλημοσύνην und in V. 6 die Verwendung des Imperativs τλήτε in einem Zusammenhang, der mehr, als sich das bei Homer findet, auf eine psychologische Konfliktsituation geht. Aber es würde zu weit führen, das hier durch homerische Stellen zu illustrieren. Noch eins: mir scheint die Verwendung alter Schemata und das oft kaum merkbare Eindringen von Neuem grundsätzlich bei Archilochos nicht anders auszusehen als auch etwa bei der bildenden Kunst Griechenlands in jener Zeit, oder überhaupt in Zeiten, da strenge Formen sich wandeln und auflösen.

M. Page: In manchem bin ich mit Professor Snell einverstanden, und ich betone wieder, dass ich das Originelle im Archilochos grundsätzlich gar nicht leugne. Doch bezweifle ich, wie weit es

für uns möglich ist, die eigenartigen Elemente zu identifizieren. Was Professor Snell für Archilochos bei der *κρατερή τλημοσύνη* in Anspruch nimmt, könnte ich für die homerische Vorlage ebensogut in Anspruch nehmen. Mir scheint im Wesentlichen dasselbe bei beiden gesagt und gemeint zu werden. In anderen Beispielen, wie bei seiner Bemerkung über *σύμμαχος*, finde ich mich überzeugt, und nehme seine Erklärung dankbar an.

M. Treu: Iamben hat man sicher vor Archilochos gekannt, aber sehen Sie Anhaltspunkte für die Annahme, dass es lokale Iambendichtung in Paros vor Archilochos gegeben hat?

Theoretisch wäre dann zu fragen, ob nicht Ihre Folgerungen über die so andersartige, weil in diesem u.a. Fällen schriftliche Dichtungsweise des Archilochos in 102 D. abgeschwächt werden, wenn die Existenz lokaler Iambendichtung schon vor unserem Dichter zuzugeben ist. Nicht-epische Dichtungstradition träte dann neben die epische.

M. Page: For reasons given in my paper, I hold it probable that the composition of iambic and trochaic verse is much older than the use of the alphabet in Greek lands. Archilochus certainly had predecessors, but I do not see how we can tell what level of art had been attained before his time. His own iambs and trochaics are based stylistically upon the traditional Epic language, not upon any divergent, specifically iambotrochaic, inheritance, if indeed anything of the kind existed.

M. Snell: Schon der Name Jambus lässt auf älteren Ursprung schliessen.

M. Pouilloux: Je voudrais revenir sur quelques-unes des questions que M. Page a si heureusement posées et définies. Tout d'abord la date d'Archiloque. Elle me semble fixée avec certitude, et non seulement par la critique interne des documents, par les concordances avec les archives orientales, telles que F. Jacoby, puis Van Compernelle les ont mises en lumière, mais encore par le contexte parien et thasien tel que l'archéologie le restitue: témoignage d'une société au goût évolué où la « littérature » d'Archiloque s'encadre naturellement. Loin qu'il y ait des

dissonances entre les documents archéologiques et la littérature, il me paraît tout au contraire y avoir une manière de complémentarité. La date d'Archiloque, de son *akmé*, doit être fixée aux environs de 650, peut-être quelques années plus tard, sans nul doute pas plus tôt.

Deuxième point: le matériel sur lequel on aurait pu transcrire les poèmes d'Archiloque, si on avait voulu ou su les écrire. Si Miss Jeffery n'a pensé qu'au cuir, excluant le papyrus à juste titre, on pourrait cependant envisager d'autres matériaux; les tablettes d'argile aussi bien en Assyrie qu'à Pylos nous montrent que sur un document léger, de petites dimensions, on pouvait écrire des textes d'une longueur considérable. Cela ne signifie pas pour autant que l'on ait écrit les poèmes d'Archiloque pour en faire une édition *ne varietur*. Cela ne signifie pas davantage qu'Archiloque ait composé ses poèmes en les écrivant, tel un écrivain moderne — et c'est évidemment cette manière de faire qu'il serait important de pouvoir définir. Mais je ne pense pas que l'on puisse trouver un argument dans l'absence d'un matériel convenable pour supporter cette rédaction. Si Archiloque l'avait voulu, il aurait pu écrire ses poèmes. Mais peut-être n'en a-t-il pas même senti le besoin.

Et maintenant la question de l'alphabet qu'il aurait employé. Certes, il aurait fait usage de l'alphabet que les Pariens utilisaient de son temps, mais là non plus on ne peut trouver une preuve que ses poèmes n'ont pas été écrits. Tout d'abord cet alphabet parien ou thasien n'est nullement plus « barbare » que l'alphabet attique; bien au contraire: les différenciations dont il dispose sont beaucoup plus évoluées que celle de l'alphabet attique du v^e siècle. L'alphabet parien du vii^e siècle offrait à Archiloque le système complet qui lui aurait été nécessaire pour mettre ses poèmes par écrit. Et cette mise en forme n'aurait été en aucune manière un obstacle à la transmission du poème et à sa transcription en attique, par exemple. Car on ne conçoit guère comment à la fin du vi^e siècle on aurait pu faire autrement à Athènes pour éditer Homère qu'en dictant à plusieurs secrétaires à la fois un texte, soit récité, soit

même lu. Enfin penser qu'un Athénien du v^e siècle aurait été incapable de comprendre une inscription parienne du vi^e ou même du vii^e siècle, me paraît très difficile. Les différences, somme toute, ne portent que sur quelques lettres, sur un vocalisme régulièrement constitué. Il n'était, je pense, guère plus difficile pour un Athénien de 350 av. J.-C. de lire un texte parien du vi^e siècle qu'une inscription attique de 450 av. J.-C. Je ne crois pas en conséquence que l'on puisse se fonder sur l'alphabet pour dire que les poèmes d'Archiloque n'ont pas été écrits, ni même qu'Archiloque n'a pas composé par écrit.

Mais, à mon sens, cela ne signifie pas pour autant que ces arguments puissent être employés contre la thèse de M. Page. Je crois au contraire capitales les analyses si précises et pertinentes qu'il a faites en confrontant les fragments d'Archiloque et la phraséologie homérique. Mais, en vérité, cette confrontation d'Homère, il faut la faire, nous le savons bien, avec toute la poésie grecque. A partir de l'époque alexandrine en tout cas, et jusqu'à la fin de la civilisation antique, être poète ne consistait-il pas avant tout à écrire une œuvre qui pût se comparer à celle d'Homère, en empruntant les formes mêmes de l'épopée, mais en y introduisant les variantes qui sont comme autant de signes à l'initié, autant de marques aussi d'une habileté technique qui est en définitive la consécration du poète ? Que l'on pense seulement à la poésie d'Apollonius de Rhodes ou aux épigrammes funéraires de l'époque romaine ou byzantine. Précisément, si l'on compare « l'imitation » d'Apollonius de Rhodes et les emprunts poétiques d'Archiloque, la différence n'apparaît-elle pas, éclatante ! Il serait aisé de montrer que chez Apollonius de Rhodes le jeu de l'imitation est infiniment plus subtil et compliqué. Je me suis amusé cette année en étudiant le chant III d'Apollonius à noter très précisément les passages homériques qu'il contamine selon les tableaux qu'il compose. On s'aperçoit alors que son imitation ne joue pas sur le poème homérique d'une façon globale ; tout se passe au contraire comme s'il relisait tel passage de l'*Odyssée*, tel autre de l'*Iliade* pour telle description. Les procédés mêmes sont tellement plus raffinés, soit

que telle forme unique chez Homère soit reprise mais en usant par exemple du moyen au lieu de l'actif, soit encore — et le cas est fréquent — par une rupture de l'ordre des mots, une manière de dislocation qui fait que le tour n'est plus tout à fait homérique tout en restant fondamentalement homérique.

Les analyses de M. Page ne nous ont-elles pas montré que le caractère homérique de la poésie d'Archiloque est tout autre: comme si le poète avait eu à sa disposition entière non plus l'*écrit* homérique mais bien l'*expression* homérique, où il façonne une forme nouvelle. Il me semble que si l'on pouvait poursuivre ce parallèle entre ces deux manières « d'utiliser » Homère, on serait de plus en plus d'accord avec la thèse de M. Page. Et peut-être serais-je tenté d'aller plus loin encore et de poser au moins cette question: ce passage, capital, entre ce que l'on pourrait appeler une civilisation orale et une civilisation écrite, ne se fait-il pas beaucoup plus tard? Pour ma part, je me demande s'il ne faut pas attendre les enquêtes philologiques des grands sophistes du v^e siècle pour entrer véritablement dans la civilisation de l'écrit, où l'écrit comptera par lui-même et pour lui-même. Ce n'est qu'au v^e siècle que se ferait le passage. La prose de Thucydide, si difficile et si complexe, n'est-elle pas le premier chef-d'œuvre de cette civilisation écrite, avant que Platon se mette à composer?

M. Page: I welcome all that Professor Pouilloux has said. His observations on the difference between Archilochus and Apollonius in respect of their technique in reproducing Epic formulas are very acute, and would repay a detailed study. The suggestion that clay tablets might have been used for writing in the archaic period is interesting, and I confess I had not considered the possibility. I do not in fact know of any evidence, either archaeological or literary, that they were so used.

M. Reverdin: En plus du cuir ou de l'argile, il y a d'autres matériaux encore auxquels il convient de penser. Pausanias, par exemple, raconte (IX, 31, 4) que les prêtres de l'Hélicon lui ont montré, près de la source des Muses, *Les Travaux et les Jours* d'Hésiode gravés sur un μόλυβδον — sans doute une plaque

de plomb —; il précise que le temps en avait presque complètement effacé les lettres. Qu'il l'ait vu lui-même n'est pas certain. On peut suivre Leo (*Hesiodica*, p. 6) quand il affirme que le renseignement remonte, par Plutarque et Aristarque, à Prasiphane, ce qui le fait reculer sensiblement dans le temps. Quoi qu'il en soit de l'existence et de l'âge de ce μόλυβδον, l'hypothèse de manuscrits littéraires sur plomb à l'époque archaïque ne saurait être écartée d'emblée.

Et le bois ? Le temps a eu le plus souvent raison de lui; mais si je suis bien renseigné, on a retrouvé l'année dernière à Brauron des tablettes de bois qui rappellent opportunément un type de support de l'écriture dont nous savons à quel point il fut répandu, mais dont nous avons tendance à oublier qu'il a existé car nous n'en possédons guère d'échantillons. Bref, quand nous nous demandons si des poèmes ont été écrits, au VII^e siècle, les considérations sur l'époque où le papyrus est devenu en Grèce marchandise courante ne sont qu'un élément d'appréciation parmi beaucoup d'autres.

M. Page : I am very sceptical of the use of leather or wood as writing-materials for literature of any length (one must remember that some ten thousand lines of Sappho survived), and I have heard no evidence that papyrus was a common article of commerce in Greek lands before the latter part of the seventh century B.C. If the poems of Archilochus were written in his own lifetime, I am still waiting to hear what they were written on.

M. Bühler : Wie soll man sich, wenn es keine Schriftlichkeit gab, die « Veröffentlichung » der Gedichte des Archilochos und ihre spätere Überlieferung vorstellen ?

M. Page : Die Frage, welche Herr Bühler gestellt hat, hat mich lange besonders interessiert. Ich neige zur Meinung, dass die Gedichte des Archilochos bei Symposien oder ähnlichen gesellschaftlichen Gelegenheiten recitiert wurden. Es gibt aber Schwierigkeiten, die ich nicht zu erklären vermag. Ich weiss nicht, z.B., wie ein Gedicht, das für eine bestimmte Situation geeignet ist (wie etwa Sappho's φαίνεται μοι κῆνος), jemals

wieder recitiert werden konnte, wenn die dazu anregende Situation und die dazu gehörigen Personen längst vergessen waren. Ich gehe jetzt nicht weiter darauf ein, denn ich weiss dass Professor Dover auf diese Frage morgen zurückkommen wird.

M. Kontoleon: Ich habe mit sehr grossem Interesse gehört, was Herr Prof. Page über den Zusammenhang zwischen Homer und Archilochos gesagt hat. Die alten Grammatiker hatten die Bahn in dieser Richtung gebrochen, der die neuere Forschung (besonders M. Treu) folgt. Jetzt aber wird das Problem auf eine viel breitere und tiefere Basis gestellt. Die Verwandtschaft Homers mit Archilochos wird durchaus anerkannt. Page's These ist somit ein Beweis auch für meinen Versuch, die historische Grundlage des Archilochos in einer ähnlichen Richtung zu suchen.

Zu der in der Diskussion viel besprochenen Frage, ob Archilochos seine Gedichte geschrieben hatte, werde ich freilich keine entscheidende Antwort geben können. Zuerst die Papyrus-Frage: Gewiss, der Hafen von Naukratis war in der Zeit des Archilochos noch nicht zugänglich. Eventuell konnten aber die Griechen dieses Schreibmaterial aus anderen Häfen des Orients bekommen. Schon in der geometrischen Zeit waren griechische *Emporia* an der phoenikischen Küste vorhanden, von welchen Papyrus eingeführt werden konnte. Der Gebrauch aber von Papyrus in Griechenland wurde erst in V. Jh. allgemein. Die Schwierigkeit des Schreibmaterials existiert!

Was lehren uns die Inschriften? Ist eine « literarische » Schreibart wie die auf Papyri, Leder usw. prinzipiell möglich im archaischen Griechenland? In hellenistischer Zeit, wo jede Schrift gebraucht werden konnte, finden wir auf kolossalen Marmorplatten, wie den finanziellen Urkunden von Delos, ganz kleine Buchstaben, die den Eindruck einer Kursive machen und deren Kolumnen sich mit denen auf Papyri vergleichen lassen. In dieser Zeit werden auch gewöhnliche Dekrete mit kleinen Buchstaben, 0,5-1 cm. hoch geschrieben, und in einem « analytischen » Sprachstil. Je weiter man vom Hellenistischen ins Archaische hinaufgeht, umso knapper wird der Wortlaut, umso

grösser die Buchstaben: Dekrete des V. Jhs. haben Buchstaben von 2-3 cm. Höhe. Ich glaube, das kann unmöglich Zufall sein. Die Inschriften des VI. und dann des VII. Jhs. sind in stärkerem Masse monumental, nicht nur äusserlich der Grösse nach, sondern auch innerlich: ihr Inhalt ist imposanter. N. Himmelman-Wildschültz hat über die archaischen Bilder gesagt, sie seien mit Hieroglyphen zu vergleichen. Ich glaube dieser Vergleich muss sich nicht nur auf die archaische Bilder beschränken (vgl. *Gnomon* 1963, 633). Wörter, Wendungen, die ganze Rede der Archaik lässt *nicht alles zum Vorschein kommen*, wie es die spätere Zeit tut. Es genügt auf B. Snells *Entdeckung des Geistes* hinzuweisen. Die Rede, die die archaischen Inschriften hören lassen, ist auch bedingt, erhaben, sie lässt uns Dinge ahnen, die in ihr nicht stehen.

Zu vergessen ist auch nicht, dass in dieser Zeit der Dichter sich nicht von einer anderen gelehrten Person differenzieren lässt. Die anderen Gattungen der Gelehrsamkeit, die Prosa war noch nicht da. So musste er, wie vollends bekannt ist, auch seinem Gedächtnis irgendwie helfen: das Metron ist ein solches Hilfsmittel. Daher stammt auch die Ehre der Mnemosyne, deren Töchter den bekanntzumachenden Stoff dem Dichter ins Ohr flüsterten. Ein weiteres Hilfsmittel des früharchaischen Schreibenden, wie auch des Lesers, ist die Bustrophedonschrift, die der Hand und dem Auge hilft, die Fortsetzung nicht zu verlieren. Eine der Bustrophedonschrift parallele Erscheinung ist die *Bustrophedonbildschrift* zu nennen, worauf ich einmal kurz aufmerksam gemacht habe (*Atti del VII. Congresso internazionale di archeologia classica*, Rom 1955, S. I, 269). Jetzt kann ich ein berühmtes Beispiel anführen: Die Kypseloslade war in Friese verteilt, die Bustrophedon gerichtet waren, wie Pausanias ausdrücklich sagt.

Alle diese Ausdruckskonventionen waren wirkliche δεσμοί des Gedankens; sie werden erst in der Klassik gebrochen, also der Zeit, deren höchstes Merkmal der λόγος ist. Darf man nun annehmen, dass erst in der Zeit, da die Prosa durchgebrochen ist, auch die Schrift « profaniert », als geläufiges Mittel zu Niederschrift gebraucht zu werden begann? Es sei auch daran erinnert,

dass abgesehen von den privaten (ich finde keinen weniger trivialen Ausdruck) Inschriften, in denen es sich hauptsächlich um eine *κοινωνία* des Stifters mit der Gottheit handelt, die *ältesten* griechischen Inschriften gesetzlichen Charakters sind (Gortyn auf Kreta, erst im Anfang des V. Jhs. aufgeschrieben, *κύρβεις* von Chios um 600—570 usw.) und öffentliche Urkunden, denen allen ein sakraler Charakter zu eigen ist.

Herr Pouilloux hat an die kultischen Hymnen erinnert, die, wie er meint, in den Heiligtümern aufgeschrieben waren. Das ist eine sehr bedeutende Bemerkung. Höchst wahrscheinlich waren sie aber nicht allen Besuchern des Heiligtums zugänglich. Herodots Erzählung über das von den Priestern im Ptoion gesprochene Karisch ist sehr bezeichnend. Es beweist auf jeden Fall, dass die Kultsprache, wenn auch nur in vereinzelt Heiligtümern, sich von der gewöhnlichen abzusondern pflegte. In Bötien sind Vasen des V. Jhs. aufgefunden worden, auf denen Zeichen des mykenischen Linear B aufgemalt sind (Biesantz, in *Minoica, Festschrift Sundwall*, 1950, S. 5 ff.); das hängt sicherlich miteinander zusammen. Ich habe diese Gedanken ausgesprochen, bloss um zu zeigen, dass das Problem, als ein kulturgeschichtliches Problem, sehr vielseitig ist. Das Gesagte ist keine Stellungnahme von mir, ich möchte nur darüber weiter belehrt werden, da einmal Professor Page dieses Problem gestellt hat.

M. Page: Ich freue mich sehr über die Übereinstimmung mit einem berühmten Archäologen aus Griechenland. Im letzten Teile seines Beitrages hat er vieles beigesteuert, was mir sehr originell und wichtig zu sein scheint. Ich hoffe, dass er dieses Thema weiterführen und zur Veröffentlichung bringen wird.

M. Reverdin: Sans doute les inscriptions archaïques sur poros ou sur marbre sont-elles composées de grosses lettres; mais on n'en saurait à mon avis déduire que l'on n'ait pas su écrire au moyen de petits caractères, voire cursivement, sur d'autres matériaux. Un simple exemple: l'œnochoé du Dipylon, qui est peut-être la plus ancienne inscription grecque connue. Je ne la vois plus exactement, mais elle est de petite dimension, et dénote, si je

me souviens bien, une graphie rapide, sinon cursive. De même l'inscription trouvée naguère sur un vase, à Ischia, et bien d'autres légendes ou signatures dans la céramique. Et qui nous dit que sur du bois, de la cire, du plomb, des peaux, on n'a pas écrit dès l'époque archaïque en petits caractères ? Une autre remarque encore : beaucoup de poèmes d'Archiloque sont si étroitement liés à l'instant, aux accidents de sa propre vie ou de celle de ses compagnons, en un mot à l'éphémère qu'on peut vraiment se demander si, sans le secours de l'écriture, et cela du vivant même d'Archiloque, elles auraient eu dans la durée cette dimension qui leur vaut d'être ces jours l'objet de notre étude. Si Archiloque ne les a pas écrits lui-même, des contemporains ont pu le faire.

M. Kontoleon : Die Bemerkungen von Herrn Reverdin sind sehr richtig und es scheint, es gibt diese Ausnahmen der Regel, dass alle archaischen Inschriften mit grossen Buchstaben geschrieben waren. Die Inschrift der Dipylonkanne ist mit der Kanne nicht ganz gleichzeitig, da sie *ingeritzt*, nicht gemalt ist. Aber auf jeden Fall ist sie früher als 700 v. Chr. Sie hat noch die « primitiven » Züge der Unregelmässigkeit, während später eine Geometrisierung der Buchstaben stattfindet. Die Kleinheit der Buchstaben der Vaseninschriften erklärt sich wohl aus Symmetriegründen, da auch die Vasen klein sind. Die ganze Frage habe ich offen gelassen, doch möchte ich nicht glauben, dass eine kleine Schrift auf Papyrus zum Niederschreiben von Versen verwendet werden konnte. Vielleicht nicht auszuschliessen sind Wachstafeln, aber nur als ein gelegentliches Hilfsmittel des Dichters.

M. Pouilloux : Peut-être pourrait-on chercher un argument supplémentaire dans l'écriture du papyrus découvert à Salonique l'année dernière ? Cette écriture, en effet, ne présente aucun des caractères d'une cursive ; elle reste au contraire tout à fait « épigraphique », extraordinairement ressemblante à celle que l'on trouve sur des listes de magistrats à Thasos pour la même époque, c'est-à-dire dans les années 350-330. N'est-ce pas le signe que l'on n'avait pas commencé très tôt à écrire couramment de longs

textes littéraires ? Peut-être l'entreprise des Pisistratides est-elle même une innovation ?

M. Reverdin : Et, pourtant, j'imagine difficilement que Thucydide, que Platon, que les élèves d'Aristote dont les notes ont servi de base à certains des textes dont nous disposons n'aient pas écrit cursivement...

