The poetry of Archilochos

V

K. J. DOVER

The Poetry of Archilochos

THE POETRY OF ARCHILOCHOS

THE fragments of Archilochos present us with a remarkable variety of metrical form. Two forms, the sequence of elegiac distichs and the sequence of iambic trimeters, were destined to a longer and more illustrious life than the remainder. Their functions were increasingly differentiated during the Classical period, and it is natural for us, viewing Archilochos from the standpoint of later times, to think of him as a composer in at least two quite different genres: on the one hand, elegiacs, and on the other, that group of forms to which I shall consistently refer as a whole by the Greek word ἴαμβοι (though I retain the English adjectives « iambic » and « trochaic » in their usual restricted sense). This impression, however, may be mistaken. The rhythmical affinities of the elegiac distich are, of course, with the dactylic hexameter; but architecturally it has affinities with the many different epodic distichs employed by Archilochos — and, indeed, with the so-called ἀσυνάρτητα — in so far as it consists of a longer verse followed by a shorter one [1]. Linguistically, differentiation between elegiacs and ἴαμβοι is neither clear nor significant [2]. Both of them, like archaic epitaphs and dedicatory poems, give an epic colouring to an predominantly vernacular phonology and morphology [3]; and the colouring in elegiacs is stronger, since many epic phenomena, metrically intractable in most forms of ἴαμβοι, are welcome in elegiacs. Both of them — and this is true of archaic elegiacs in general [4], and of verse inscriptions,

[1] Cf. H. FRÄNKEL, *Dichtung und Philosophie des frühen Griechentums* (München, 1962), 168 n. 44. [2] Cf. FRÄNKEL, 168. [3] Cf. O. HOFFMANN, *Die griechischen Dialekte*, 3 (Göttingen, 1898), 182 ff.; the epic colouring is less in Archilochos and Kallinos than in their successors. [4] Cf. A. FICK, *NJA*, 1 (1898), 509. ἐπε[ί ῥ']ἐ[ν]εδέξατο is presented

irrespective of metre — eschew the particles and combinations of particles which are characteristic of epic and highly convenient in dactylic rhythm: νυ, ῥα, ἀλλά τε, γάρ τε, δέ τε, καί τε and μέν τε, all of which are prominent in the hexameters of the later philosophical poets, Xenophanes (*Fr.* 13D.3, 20D.), Parmenides and Empedokles.

When we turn from form to content and ethos we observe that Archilochos's elegiacs, like his ἴαμβοι, may be ostensibly addressed to individuals. The gnomic character explicit in the elegiac fragments 7D. (κήδεα μὲν στονόεντα κτλ.) and 9D. (Αἰσιμίδη κτλ.) and implicit in 10D.3f. (οὔτε τι γὰρ κλαίων κτλ.) is prominent also in the trochaic fragments 58D. (τοῖς θεοῖς ἰθεῖα πάντα κτλ.), 64D. (οὔ τις αἰδοῖος μετ' ἀστῶν κτλ.), 67aD. (θυμέ, θύμ', κτλ.) and 68D. (τοῖος ἀνθρώποισι θυμός κτλ.) [1]. The moral tone of all these fragments can be summarised as a shrug of the shoulders, a gesture of resignation which contains at the same time an assurance of self-sufficiency. The gesture of resignation is not, however, a gesture of modesty; with the boast of the elegiac fragment 1D. (εἰμὶ δ' ἐγὼ κτλ.) we may compare the trochaic fragment 66D. (ἓν δ' ἐπίσταμαι μέγα κτλ.) and the powerful lines in one of the new iambic fragments, 35LB.7ff. (ἐς τοῦτο δή τοι τῆς ἀνολβείης δοκ[έω]| ἥκειν; κτλ.). Flippancy is the keynote of the elegiac *Fr.* 6D. (ἀσπίδι μὲν Σαΐων τις κτλ.), and the vigorous exhortation to drunkenness in 5AD.6ff. (ἀλλ' ἄγε σὺν κώθωνι κτλ.) is matched in the ἴαμβοι by lively anticipations (*Fr.* 69D. and 72D.) and descriptions (*Fr.* 28D., 34D., 102D.) of sexual indulgence. The grim joke of the elegiac *Fr.* 4D. (ξείνια δυσμενέσιν λυγρὰ χαριζόμενοι) appears to recur in the new trochaic

by Diehl[3] in Mimnermos *Fr.* 12 (A). 1; ἐπείτ'? In Solon *Fr.* 3D.33 καὶ θαμά is interpreted by Bergk (but not by Diehl) as καί θ' ἅμα.

[1] Cf. (ed.) M. Treu, *Archilochos* (München, 1959), 164, 166 ff.

Fr. 114LB.5ff., where ξεινίων φειδοίατ[ο is found in the same context as σ]υμβαλόντε[ς, ἀθρόοι γενοίμεθα and τεύχεσιν πεφρ[αγμένοι. *Fr.* 2D. (ἐν δορὶ κτλ.) is a polished conceit in which, ὥς γ' ἐμαυτὸν πείθω, at least three separate jokes lie in ambush for the hearer. *Fr.* 15D. (συκῆ πετραίη), though outwardly decorous in phraseology, is none the less a clever joke about a prostitute [1]. Every note which is struck in the elegiac fragments is struck also in the ἴαμβοι [2]. The reverse is not true; we do not encounter in the elegiacs the ferocity or the undisguised obscenity of the ἴαμβοι; but since the elegiac fragments amount to less than forty intelligible lines in all, representing at the most fourteen poems and possibly as few as eight, the completeness of their coincidence in ethos with the ἴαμβοι is more significant than the incompleteness of the reverse process.

I propose now to investigate the extent to which the hypothesis that for Archilochos there was no generic difference between elegiacs and ἴαμβοι accords with the history of both genres in the archaic period as a whole.

Something of value may be learnt from the relevant metrical terminology; but not, I fear, in *LSJ*, where the

[1] Cf. E. Riess, *Classical Weekly* 1943/4, 179, and Treu, *op. cit.*, 195. More than one indecent interpretation is possible. Σ Arat. 1009 says: καὶ παρ' Ἀρχιλόχῳ ἡ ὑφ' ἡδονῆς σαλευομένη κορώνη ὥσπερ κηρύλος πέτρης ἐπὶ προβλῆτος ἀπτερύσσετο (*Fr.* 49D., with Wilamowitz's ὥστε for ὥσπερ). This resembles an extract from an ornithologist's notebook, if κορώνη was really a bird; but if she was a person, it is in keeping with *Fr.* 28D. and *Fr.* 102D. I suspect that κορώνη must be added to Archilochos's numerous terms for «prostitute»; in *Fr.* 49D. the girl, ὑφ' ἡδονῆς σαλευομένη (cf. ἀμφισαλευομένης, *Anth. Pal.* V. 55, 6; Hor. *Sat.* II, 7, 50), « was, as it were, a Κηρύλος shuffling its wings... ». Thus in *Fr.* 15D. Pasiphile is compared to a host who can entertain lavishly because of the herds and flocks which he βόσκει; cf. the classical πορνοβοσκός. [2] Cf. A. Hauvette, *Archiloque* (Paris, 1905), 245 ff.; the insistence of F. Della Corte, *RF* 68 (1940), 93 that the ethos of elegiacs and ἴαμβοι is fundamentally different seems coloured by the later history of the genres.

principal articles on metrical terms are characterised by the highest degree of confusion and error [1]. Comparatively few of the terms used by the Hellenistic metricians are attested in extant Greek literature before the end of the fourth century B.C., and where they occur the context rarely permits us to say exactly what they mean.

The word ἴαμβος first occurs in *Fr.* 20D. of Archilochos, καί μ(οι) οὔτ' ἰάμβων οὔτε τερπωλέων μέλει, in which, according to Tzetzes, he is « speaking to those who urge him to write » when he is overcome with grief at his kinsman's death. Whether Archilochos meant by ἴαμβοι his poetry as a whole, irrespective of its metrical form, or one category of his poetry only, we do not know; three different interpretations of οὔτ' ἰάμβων οὔτε τερπωλέων are possible [2], and both meanings of ἴαμβοι would be reconcilable with each of the three. Aristotle (*Rhet.* 1418*b* 28ff.) used ἴαμβος to denote a poem of Archilochos composed of iambic trimeters and also to denote one composed of trochaic tetrameters. If, therefore, a poem was called ἴαμβος in the fourth century B.C. by virtue of its form, the minimum connotation of the word at that time was « poem in iambic or trochaic rhythm ». This would be consistent with Herodotos's statement (I. 12.2) that Archilochos spoke of Gyges ἐν ἰάμβῳ τριμέτρῳ i.e. « in a trimetric ἴαμβος », « in an ἴαμβος composed of trimeters » (cf. I. 47.2 ἐν ἑξαμέτρῳ τόνῳ). It is also consistent with Aristophanes, *Frogs* 661, where Dionysos quotes an iambic trimeter which he describes as coming from « an ἴαμβος of Hipponax ». Clearly iambic rhythm came to be regarded as the characteristic rhythm of ἴαμβοι, for in Platon (*Resp.* 400*b*, where Sokrates is referring to the technical

[1] There are some excellent remarks by U. BAHNTJE, *Quaestiones Archilocheae* (Diss. Göttingen, 1900), 23 ff. [2] « Neither ἴαμβοι (as creative work) nor relaxation », « neither ἴαμβοι (as expression of bitterness and enmity) nor enjoyment », and « neither ἴαμβοι nor < any other > enjoyment ».

terminology of Damon) and Aristotle, *Rhet.* 1408*b* 33, ἴαμβος is the name not of a kind of poem but of a kind of rhythm, and in both passages it is distinguished from τροχαῖος. The derived word ἰαμβεῖον, which first occurs in Kritias *Fr.* 2D.4 and Aristophanes, *Frogs* 1133, 1204, denotes in all three passages an iambic trimeter. Naturally we cannot know for certain whether Kritias and Aristophanes would have applied it also to a trochaic tetrameter. Damon would certainly not have done so; nor would Aristotle, for in speaking of the dialogue of drama (*Poet.* 1449*a* 21, *Rhet.* 1408*b* 35) he distinguishes between the ἰαμβεῖον and the τετράμετρον.

Whereas it was natural to discuss ἴαμβος before ἰαμβεῖον, in the case of the pair ἔλεγος/ἐλεγεῖον it is necessary to reverse the process. The neuter noun ἐλεγεῖον first occurs in Pherekrates (*Fr.* 153K.7), Kritias (*Fr.* 2D.3), Thucydides (I. 132.2f.) and the poem composed by Ion of Samos for the dedication of Lysander at Delphi. Neither of the meanings « verse inscription » or « dedicatory poem » is reconcilable with Pherekrates and Kritias, and the meaning « epitaph » is not reconcilable with any of them. The meaning « elegiac distich » suits Kritias and Thucydides, and also Pherekrates, who used the plural to denote discontinuous verses cited from a poem (Theognis 467ff.) which was composed in elegiacs (cf. also Plato, *Meno* 95*d*), but does not suit Ion, who denotes by ἐλεγεῖον a poem of two distichs; and the meaning « poem in elegiacs » does not suit Pherekrates. The most plausible hypothesis is that ἐλεγεῖον in the fifth century B.C. normally meant « elegiac distich », and that Ion used it with reference to a poem of two distichs because that poem was serving a purpose very often served by a single distich. Thus ἐλεγεῖον, like ἰαμβεῖον, denotes a metrical unit; and since an ἰαμβεῖον was a unit characteristic of a kind of poem called ἴαμβος, it follows that at some time and place in the Greek world before Pherekrates

there existed a kind of poem called ἔλεγος, and that the elegiac metre was, or became, characteristic of it [1].

The word ἔλεγος is first attested in the dedication of Echembrotos the Arkadian, cited by Pausanias X.7.4 [2] and dated by him to the first Pythiad. This poem, although it distinguishes ἔλεγοι from μέλη, does not tell us what they were. Since the musician and poet Sakadas of Argos, associated with Echembrotos by Pausanias on the strength of the Pythian records, is also described in *De musica* (8) as ποιητὴς μελῶν τε καὶ ἐλεγείων μεμελοποιημένων and (9) as leader of a school of elegiac poets, it seems that an association between the generic term ἔλεγος and the elegiac metre existed in the Peloponnese in the sixth century B.C. This is not to say that every Peloponnesian ἔλεγος had always been composed in the elegiac metre, or that every poem in elegiacs would have been called ἔλεγος by the Peloponnesians. Nor does it imply that the word ἔλεγος was known to Archilochos and his Ionian contemporaries. It is noteworthy that in Attic tragedy ἔλεγος first appears in Euripides, who uses it five times; it is absent from Aischylos and Sophokles, despite the great range of their vocabulary for all kinds of vocal and musical utterance. In four of these five Euripidean instances the word refers to a lament; but in two of them (*Hel.* 185, *I.T.* 146) its accompaniment by the adjective ἄλυρος suggests that Euripides thought of it as normally — that is to say, in circumstances which do not call for lamentation — accompanied by the lyre [3]. In the fifth passage (*Hypsipyle* 62 Page) Ἀσιάδ' ἔλεγον ἰήϊον denotes the music which Orpheus

[1] The feminine noun ἐλεγεία, « poem composed of elegiac distichs », first occurs in Aristotle, *Ath.* 5.2. Kallimachos refers to his own elegiac poems as ἔλεγοι (*Fr.* 7Pf.13); that is the earliest certain example of an equation ἔλεγοι = ἐλεγεῖαι. [2] The dedicatory poem defies restoration as elegiacs, but Pausanias is clearly quoting, not paraphrasing, and I assume that the essentials μέλεα καὶ ἐλέγους are authentic. [3] Cf. M. PLATNAUER on *I.T.* 146.

played on his lyre to enable the crew of the Argo to row in time [1]. This points to something different from the ἔλεγοι of Echembrotos and the elegiacs of Sakadas, which were threnodic in character and accompanied by the flute [2]. The semantic history of ἔλεγος and ἐλεγεῖον thus seems to be one in which arbitrary choice and historical accident have played their familiar role in semantics; there were ἔλεγοι, of which some were threnodic and aulodic, of which some, again, were in the elegiac metre; and that is how and why the elegiac distich acquired the name by which it was known universally from the fifth century B.C. onwards.

This survey of terminology offers no grounds for doubting the conclusion which I drew from the community of ethos between the elegiacs and ἴαμβοι of Archilochos: no grounds for believing that he regarded them as different genres. It also leaves open the possibility that he used the word ἴαμβοι with reference to all the forms of poem which he composed, their common characteristic being not their metre or language but the type of occasion for which they were composed — their « social context », in fact. It has, however, raised another question: since an association between the elegiac metre and threnodic poetry existed in the Peloponnese at least as early as the beginning of the sixth century B.C., are we to suppose that the elegiac metre was employed from prehistoric and preliterate times indepen-

[1] It is 'Ασιάς because it is played on the lyre (cf. Eur. *Cyc.* 443, where 'Ασιάδος ... κιθάρας is associated with merrymaking) and ἰήϊος perhaps because of the association between rowing and rhythmic cries (cf. ἰήϊον ... Παιᾶνα in Aisch. *Ag.* 146). [2] Cf. D. L. PAGE, in *Greek Poetry and Life* (Oxford, 1936), 206 ff., on threnodic and aulodic elegiacs in the Peloponnese and the ancestry of the elegiac passage Eur. *Andr.* 103 ff. K. ZACHER, *Ph.* N.S. 11 (1898), 8 ff., in pursuance of a fallacious inference that elegiacs must always have been the characteristic metrical form of the threnodic ἔλεγος, combined with a persuasive argument that the origin of the word ἔλεγος is to be sought in a cry like the Germanic *welaga*, posits an original refrain Ϝηλεγε Ϝηλεγε Ϝη. It might just as well have been ελεγελεγελεγει.

dently in both Ionia and the mainland, or that it was imported from one to the other? And, if it was imported, who imported it to whom?

A decisive answer to this question is indicated by the fact that the language of Tyrtaios [1] is derived not primarily or directly from epic but from the Ionic vernacular [2].

I base this statement in the first instance on two phenomena in Tyrtaios's adaptation (*Fr.* 7D.21ff.) of the theme represented also in *X* 66ff., where Priam envisages his own fate. The point I am making is, strictly speaking, independent of the problem of the chronological relation between these two passages [3]; on that, I confine myself to an affirmation of agreement with Wilamowitz [4] to the extent of saying that the passage of Tyrtaios is a transmutation into elegiacs of a passage which already existed in hexameters [5]. Be that as it may, where Homer (71) has νέῳ δέ τε πάντ' ἐπέοικεν Tyrtaios (27f.) has νέοισι δὲ πάντ' ἐπέοικεν, followed by ὄφρ' ἐρατῆς ἥβης ἀγλαὸν ἄνθος ἔχῃ. To understand «a young man» as subject of ἔχῃ [6], or to take ἄνθος as subject [7] and understand «them» as object, are both linguisti-

[1] My argument assumes the authenticity of the fragments of Tyrtaios, since (*a*) I see no force in the contrary arguments, many of which, in any case, were offered before the publication of the papyrus (*Fr.* 1D. 50 ff.) which refers to the tribal army, (*b*) in their preference for $\underline{3}\,\cup|$ over $\underline{3}|$ and for $\underline{4}\,\cup\,\cup$ over $\underline{4}|$ the fragments agree with early elegy in general but disagree with the elegiacs of Xenophanes and Kritias, and (*c*) in spirit and style they are archaic (cf. JÄGER, *SPAW* 1932, 537 ff., and E. RÖMISCH, *Studien zur älteren griechischen Elegie* [Frankfurt, 1933], 70 ff.). [2] Cf. O. HOFFMANN-A. DEBRUNNER, *Geschichte der griechischen Sprache* 1^3 (Berlin, 1953), 75. [3] On this much-discussed problem cf. O. VON WEBER, *Die Beziehungen zwischen Homer und den älteren griechischen Lyrikern* (Diss. Bonn, 1955), 35 ff. [4] *Die Ilias und Homer* (Berlin, 1920), 95 f. n. 1; cf. C. ROTHE, *Jb. d. philol. Vereins zu Berlin* 33 (1907), 302. [5] There are, of course, other passages in elegiac poets (e.g. Theognis 389-392) which make a similar impression, but for which no actual hexametric original can be suggested. [6] Cf. passages cited by Diehl^3 *ad loc.* [7] Cf. *LSJ* s.v. ἔχω (A). A.I.8.

cally possible [1], but neither is smooth or natural. All awkwardness could have been avoided if Tyrtaios had availed himself fully of epic diction and said νέῳ δέ τε; but, like all the early elegists and the composers of verse inscriptions, he eschewed those combinations of particles which are characteristic of epic and distinguish it from drama and prose [2]. Now, in the previous line (26) he says αἰσχρὰ τά γ' ὀφθαλμοῖς καὶ νεμεσητὸν ἰδεῖν. Again we have a syntactical inconcinnity avoidable [3] by simply observing initial digamma in ἰδεῖν and saying νεμεσητά. Tyrtaios would have found the digamma of ἰδεῖν observed often enough in epic; and his Lakonian audience observed it in their own speech; why then did he strike an alien note by dropping it? In fact, he normally drops it. πίονα ἔργα (*Fr.* 4D.7) is a Homeric phrase and ὄβριμα ἔργα (*Fr.* 8D.27) is of familiar epic type; περὶ ᾗ πατρίδι, a certain emendation in *Fr.* 6D.2, accords with the general poetic observance of digamma in the possessive ὅς. Elsewhere, observance of digamma could be restored by emendation in three passages (*Fr.* 1D.46, 6.8, 8.15), but there remain seven passages in which it could not (*Fr.* 3*a*D.1, 3*b*.1 [4], 3*b*.2, 4.4, 6.9, 8.7, 9.19). In this respect Tyrtaios's principle is that of the Ionian elegiac poets, but it is conspicuously at variance with that of all the archaic verse inscriptions, which, whatever their metre and whatever the degree of epic phraseology they adopt, observe digamma in regions where the vernacular observed it and omit it in regions where the vernacular

[1] Cf. KÜHNER-GERTH, *Gr. Gr.* I 87. Theognis 381 f. provide a parallel shift from plural to singular, and so do Archilochos *Fr.* 58D. 4 f. if Friedländer's emendation κείνοισ' is right. [2] Cf. p. 183 n. 3 supr. [3] The « natural » way of making a point like that of 21 ff. may be seen in Plato, *Lg.* 879*c*, where we may suspect that Tyrtaios was not far from Plato's mind: αἰκίαν οὖν περὶ πρεσβύτερον ἐν πόλει γενομένην ὑπὸ νεωτέρου ἰδεῖν αἰσχρὸν καὶ θεομισές· ἔοικεν δὲ νέῳ παντὶ ὑπὸ γέροντος πληγέντι ῥᾳθύμως ὀργὴν ὑποφέρειν κτλ. [4] Πυθωνόθεν οἴκαδ' is hardly susceptible of emendation; cf. *Maia* N.S. 15 (1963), 19 f.

omitted it [1]. Among the verse inscriptions particular mention should be made of a sixth century stele from the sanctuary of Athena Chalkioikos at Sparta, which contains either a hymn or a long dedication [2]; beginning Παλ(λ)ὰς Ἀθαναία θύ[γατερ Διός (?), it exhibits at one point].τα Fιδε(ῖ)ν, with digamma written and metrically observed.

I do not believe that non-observance of digamma in Tyrtaios can be explained by the fact that to a Lakonian what might appear especially remarkable in epic would be not the general presence of digamma but its occasional absence, so that he would regard its non-observance as epic colouring; this explanation might suffice if Tyrtaios were an isolated phenomenon, but it does not account for the situation in Ionic elegy or verse-inscriptions. Nor do I believe that a satisfactory explanation is afforded by acceptance of the story that Tyrtaios was not a Lakonian but an Athenian. This story is first found in Plato (*Lg.* 629*a*), and since it illustrates the theme of community of interest between Sparta and Athens which is so prominent throughout the first part of *Laws* (cf. 642*b-d*) I am by no means persuaded that it antedates the fourth century B.C. It is evident from Strabo's discussion (362) that there was nothing in the matter of Tyrtaios's own poems to justify the story [3]. It should also be observed, first, that not everyone agreed with Plato, since Tyrtaios in the Suda is « Lakonian or Milesian», and, secondly, that Tyrtaios was not the only eminent figure of archaic times to be awarded a posthumous and gratuitous Athenian nationality in the fourth century. Ephoros (*Fr.* 137J.) did

[1] Cf. B. Kock, *De Epigrammatum Graecorum Dialectis* (Diss. Göttingen, 1910), and Hoffmann-Debrunner, *op. cit.*, 79 f. [2] A. M. Woodward, *ABSA* 29 (1927/8), 45 ff.; *SEG* 11.652; L. H. Jeffery, *The Local Scripts of Archaic Greece* (Oxford, 1961), 192, 199. [3] Strabo's positive deduction of Tyrtaios's Spartan nationality was, of course, fallacious (cf. Schmid-Stählin, *Gesch. d. gr. Lit.* I 1, 385 n. 2); it is the absence of any contrary indication which is important.

the same for Thukles, the founder of the first Greek colony in Sicily, and produced a story to explain how an Athenian came to be leading an expedition of Chalkideans and Naxians; Hellanikos (*Fr.* 82J.) and Thucydides (VI. 3.1), however, plainly regarded Thukles as a Chalkidean.

If Tyrtaios in composing elegiac poetry for a Lakonian audience adopted a poetic form long familiar in the Peloponnese and brought it into conformity with Homeric epic by adoption of Ionic eta and elements of epic phraseology, his persistent non-observance of digamma is not intelligible. If, however, he adopted a poetic form which existed only in the Ionic vernacular, his decision to conform with the most conspicuous phonological features of that vernacular, while also drawing upon epic material and phraseology, calls for no further justification.

Adoption of the hypothesis that the elegiac distich was an Ionian poetic form, and that it was brought into the Peloponnese by, or in the time of, Tyrtaios makes it difficult to accept both the statement by Herakleides Ponticus (*Fr.* 157 Wehrli), summarised in *De musica* 3, that elegiac poetry was composed by Klonas and the statement of *De musica* 5 that Klonas was earlier than Archilochos. Rejection of part, or even the whole, of this complex of statements attached to so shadowy a figure as Klonas does no violence to my conscience [1].

Tyrtaios's poetry is hortatory in character, and the gnomic and narrative elements in it are plainly subservient. Between his ethos and that of Archilochos there is at first sight a great gap. This gap is half bridged by Kallinos, the contemporary [2] of Archilochos, who composed at least one hortatory

[1] Klonas is associated with Terpander, and is thus closer to historical reality than—for example— Olympos; but the Suda calls even Olympos («pupil of Marsyas ... before the Trojan War») ποιητὴς μελῶν καὶ ἐλεγείων. [2] Strabo's reason (647) for dating Kallinos *before* Archilochos, in which he is followed by (e.g.) SCHMID-STÄHLIN, *op. cit.*, 357, and

poem in elegiacs, from which our only extensive citation (*Fr.* 1D.) is drawn. The other half of the bridge is furnished by the ἴαμβοι of Archilochos, in which a hortatory element is clearly discernible: *Fr.* 52D. (ὦ λιπερνῆτες πολῖται κτλ.), 74D. (μηδεὶς ἔθ' ὑμέων εἰσορῶν θαυμαζέτω), 127LB. (πάντ' [ἐύφρ]ονες γένεσθε[...]... συμβα[λεῖ]ν δ' ἴωμεν ἔντεα) and perhaps 114LB.7 (ἀθρόοι γενοίμεθα).

Thus Tyrtaios did not inherit a tradition of hortatory elegiacs [1]; he took one element out of the many which existed in Ionian poetry, and by exploiting its possibilities created a new genre. There was nothing inevitable about this; had there been no Tyrtaios, another individual might have developed a different element of Ionian poetry in quite another direction. An instructive parallel is provided by the circumstances in which elegiacs supplanted hexameters as the metrical form regarded as appropriate for epitaphs. Down to the middle of the sixth century B.C. all extant verse inscriptions — epitaphs, dedications and graffiti alike — are, with two exceptions [2], in dactylic hexameters. One exception is the iambic graffito preceding the hexameters on

LESKY, *Gesch. d. gr. Lit.*, 111, was trivial; the evidence of Lydian and Assyrian chronology (cf. H. KALETSCH, *Historia* 7 [1958], 1 ff.) proves no more than that both poets were active in the middle of the seventh century B.C. I see no reason to date any poem of Tyrtaios earlier than 640. His statement (*Fr.* 4D.) that Messenia was conquered by πατέρων ἡμετέρων πατέρες in the reign of Theopompos is perfectly valid if made eighty years after the conquest; it would be exaggeration, or imprecision, only if the interval approached a hundred years; and it is not Tyrtaios's purpose to give us chronological information. [1] F. DÜMMLER, *Ph.* 53 (1894), 201 ff., argued that the original function of elegiac poetry was that of the war-dance (« patriotische Ekstase »); but he conceived the problem in the wrong terms. [2] I exclude from consideration the elegiac dedication (*Fr.* 17D.) and epitaph (*Fr.* 16D.) attributed to Archilochos in the *Anthology*; the attribution is to be treated with greatest caution, considering the irresponsibility with which verse inscriptions were assigned to famous names (cf. M. BOAS, *De epigrammatis Simonideis* [Groningen, 1905], 32 ff., WILAMOWITZ, *Sappho und Simonides* [Berlin, 1913], 192 ff., F. JACOBY,

the Ischia cup [1]. The other is the syllables]γαλης αντι φιλημ[on a dinos from the Heraion at Samos dating from the second half of the seventh century [2]; presumably με]γάλης ἀντὶ φιλημ[οσύνης, a phrase which would fit into an elegiac pentameter but not into a dactylic hexameter. Then, within the period 560-540, both the elegiac distich and the iambic trimeter appear simultaneously in both epitaphs and dedications [3]. The dominance of the hexameter collapses; elegiacs and iambics contend briefly for the succession [4], and the elegiacs win decisively; from the third quarter of the sixth century onwards they are the favoured metrical form of epitaphs and dedications alike, a new genre created by a change in fashion of which we cannot expect to know the cause.

Let us now turn back from the threshold of the Classical age to Archilochos himself.

Hesperia 14 [1945], 196 n. 138), and in any case I am concerned here only with verses actually extant on stone. A dedication from Perachora, presented in *SEG* 11.224 as the vestiges of an elegiac distich and dated there « c. 750[a] », makes much better sense when interpreted (JEFFERY, *op. cit.*, 122 ff.) as a hexameter, and the date should probably be brought down by a hundred years. [1] *SEG* 14.604. [2] JEFFERY, *op. cit.*, 328 and pl. 63 no. 1. [3] The earliest specimens in each category are (I give JEFFERY's dates; J_1 refers to *The Local Scripts*, J_2 to *ABSA* 57 [1962], 115 ff.): (*a*) Elegiac epitaphs: grave of Chairedemos, Attica, c. 560 ? (*SEG*. 3.55 = PEEK, *GVI* 1.159 = J_1 pl. 3 no. 20 = J_2 118); grave of Tettichos, Attica, c. 560-550 ? (*IG* I² 976 = *GVI* 1.1266 = J_1 pl. 3 no. 19 = J_2 133; (*b*) Elegiac dedications: dedication of Aristis, Nemea, c. 560 ? (*SEG* 11.290 = J_1 pl. 24 no. 5); dedication of Exoides, Kephallenia, c. 550-525 ? (*IG* 9 (1).649 = J_1 pl. 45 no. 5); (*c*) Iambic epitaphs: grave of Archias and his sister, Attica, c. 540 ? (*SEG* 10.452[a] = *GVI* 1.74 = J_1 pl. 4 no. 31 = J_2 139 f.); (*d*) Iambic dedications: dedication of Alkmeonides, Attic, from Ptoion in Beotia, c. 550 (*IG* I² 472 = J_1 pl. 3 no. 25). [4] It should be noted that among the verse inscriptions tentatively assigned on epigraphic and archaeological grounds to the decade 550-540 elegiacs predominate; and from the fact that Chairedemos's name, so apt to iambics, is incongruously placed in an elegiac distich it might be inferred that the composer of his epitaph regarded elegiacs as more appropriate than iambics.

Any critical assessment of a poet necessarily involves an assessment of his originality. This is a practicable undertaking when the work of a poet's precursors in his own genres is available; but the extant Greek poetry of earlier date than Archilochos is the poetry of Homer and Hesiod. With *Works and Days*, which, like so many poems of Archilochos, is ostensibly addressed to a named individual, Archilochean poetry has a limited community of content and ethos. The animal fable, regarded in antiquity as a speciality of Archilochos, is represented by one impressive example in *Works and Days* (202ff.). The gnomic element predominant in *Works and Days* is, as we have seen, conspicuous in Archilochos; there are autobiographical elements in both *Works and Days* and *Theogony*, and *Works and Days* gives very free expression to Hesiod's own emotional attitudes. Yet the vaster scale of the Hesiodic poems amounts in itself to a fundamental difference of genre, and the flippancy, wit, scurrility and blatant eroticism of Archilochos are profoundly out of tune with Hesiod's earnestness.

Archilochos's difference from Hesiod is trivial by comparison with his difference from Homer. His spirit and ethos have often been described as a conscious rejection of the Homeric ideal [1], and this interpretation appears to have good support in *Fr.* 60D. (οὐ φιλέω μέγαν στρατηγὸν κτλ.) [2] and 6D. (ἀσπίδι μὲν Σαΐων τις κτλ.). The Homeric hero is capable of fear, but not of flippancy on the subject of his fear. The Homeric hero, again, makes handsome provision for his own sexual satisfaction, but he does

[1] LESKY, *op. cit.*, 104 f.; FRÄNKEL, *op. cit.*, 151 f., 167; B. SNELL, *Die Entdeckung des Geistes*[3] (Hamburg, 1955), 89; TREU, *Von Homer zur Lyrik* (München, 1955), 266. For reasons given above (n. 2 p. 193) I do not think that it is legitimate to speak (with FRÄNKEL, 155 n. 18) of a deliberate rejection of the martial ideal which inspired Tyrtaios.

[2] TREU, *Von Homer &c.*, 71, 78, notes a change from the Homeric *Sehweise* in this fragment; cf. SNELL, *op. cit.*, 89.

not writhe under the lash of unrequited passion [1], as Archilochos appears to do in *Fr.* 104D. (δύστηνος ἔγκειμαι πόθῳ κτλ.) and 112D. (τοῖος γὰρ φιλότητος ἔρως κτλ.). [2]. The sexual phraseology of epic is circumscribed and decorous; Archilochos's is neither [3].

Historians and critics of literature are telling the truth when they say that Archilochos introduces us to a new world [4]. If, however, they assume that what is new to us, because of the great gaps in our knowledge of antiquity, was also new to Archilochos's contemporaries, they go somewhat beyond the positive evidence and fail to do justice to some anthropological considerations which are not without evidential force.

Given the chronological order Homer — Hesiod — Archilochos and the fact that Hesiod falls between Homer and Archilochos in genre and ethos, two alternative hypotheses are rivals for our adherence. One is that between the early eighth century and the middle of the seventh the values and ideals of Greek society changed, and that Homer, Hesiod and Archilochos represent successive stages in the spiritual development of the Greek people [5]. This hypothesis can take a firm stand on the solid fact that the structure of Greek society in the eighth and seventh centuries did undergo important changes, notably in the physical expansion of the Greek world, the enlargement of its contacts with other cultures, the development of wealth in forms other than booty and land, and the increasing demand of the citizen body within each community for a share in political power [6].

[1] Cf. SNELL, *op. cit.*, 92 f. [2] BONNARD's translation of *Fr.* 245LB. assumes, perhaps wrongly, that the poet is speaking of himself. [3] A new fragment (134LB.) presents us with an earthy Aristophanic word: γυναῖ]κα βινέων[. [4] SNELL, *op. cit.*, 87 f.; R. PFEIFFER, *Ausgewählte Schriften* (München, 1960), 43. [5] Cf. PFEIFFER, *op. cit.*, 46. [6] Cf. SNELL, *op. cit.*, 116. This view is developed to extreme lengths

The alternative hypothesis would regard Hesiod and Archilochos as two different personalities through whom, shortly after the introduction of writing, poetic genres of long standing found expression at a very high artistic level. These two poets would represent the substratum upon which a highly specialised development of epic poetry had been superimposed. Homer and Archilochos would represent the obverse and reverse of the same coin; there would be no point of contact between them, and therefore no field of conflict. So it might be said that Archilochos expressed the feelings of men as they really were; Hesiode described the actions, thoughts and speech of a race of imaginary heroes, ἀνδρῶν ἡρώων θεῖον γένος, οἳ καλέονται ἡμίθεοι, creatures of superhuman ferocity and extravagance. One may reject a view of one's ancestors by talking about *them*, but it is not so easy to reject a view of them by talking about one's own day. The coexistence of Homeric and Archilochean poetry is, after all, less striking than the coexistence of Attic ἐπιτάφιοι with *Acharnians* [1]. The very nature of epic poetry demanded professional rhapsodes and the creation of a highly conventional language, and didactic poetry made similar demands in so far as it rivalled epic in scale, whereas the maker of short songs was naturally always an amateur. The rhapsodes, their imagination committed to a heroic world, not only elaborated a special language (which, of course, influenced their concepts, as language does) but filled in the details of this world with a conventional ethos and theology; the extent to which a professional reciter-composer may adopt a conventional *Sehweise* and project himself into a different culture is a

by BONNARD, xxx ff., xliv f., lvi; and it influences his interpretation of some of the fragments, e.g. 9D. (Αἰσιμίδη κτλ), which really says no more than 35LB. 3 f. (φάτιν μὲν τὴν πρὸς ἀνθρώπω[ν κακὴν]| μὴ τετραμήνης μηδέν). [1] Cf. O. SEEL in *Festschrift Franz Dornseiff* (Leipzig, 1953), 311.

problem which deserves further study by comparativists and not a priori generalisations [1]. The amateur poet, by contrast, expressed feelings and beliefs in terms familiar to contemporary society.

The second hypothesis must, I think, concede one point: the simple fact that when Archilochos, as a young member of a distinguished family on the island of Paros in the seventh century, grew up to find himself a poet of genius, he did not compose epic narrative or heroic catalogues or didactic poetry; he composed songs. We are bound to wonder whether he would have done that if he had been born a hundred years earlier; and idle though such speculation may seem, we would be wise to leave open the possibility that it was changes in Greek society during the early seventh century which had made the song artistically respectable. But then we must ask another question of a less speculative nature: what were Greek songs like a hundred or two hundred years before Archilochos? Song is a phenomenon of every human culture without exception, however primitive; therefore there *were* Greek songs before Archilochos. I am reluctant to use as evidence those remnants of Greek folksong and cult-song which have survived in citation, for none of them is necessarily of the degree of antiquity which we are seeking; in a culture which produces and values poetry of high quality, subliterate poetry tends to become subliterary and derivative [2]. We need to draw our evidence from the songs of modern preliterate cultures. If we find that the

[1] On the development of special characteristics in epic cf. C. M. BOWRA, *Heroic Poetry* (London, 1952), especially chapters 2-4. A trivial but striking example is provided by a Dayak epic (which « if it were given in full, would take nearly a whole night to sing ») mentioned by H. M. and N. CHADWICK, *The Growth of Literature* (Cambridge, 1940), 3.480 f.: « a long house which a bird could only just fly through in a day »; cf. γ 321 f. [2] Cf. the manner in which popular music and the background music of films echo the idiom of the concert-hall of fifty years ago.

same characteristics recur in many different parts of the world, in cultures so diverse that they have little in common except an ignorance of writing, we shall be tempted to attribute these characteristics to the preliterate songs of the Greeks [1]; and if we find some of them present also in the fragments of Archilochos himself and of other archaic Greek poets, we shall not be rational if we do not yield to the temptation. Before I embark on this part of my enquiry, let me say firmly and clearly that I am well aware that the Ionians of the seventh century B.C. were immeasurably more civilised (in any sense of the word which deserves serious consideration) than any of the cultures to which I shall shortly refer. They were, however, not yet generally accustomed to the use of writing, and for that reason I shall draw my comparative material from cultures in which the possibility of writing has simply not been envisaged. I want to give a picture of the preliterate in its purest form.

A high proportion of songs in preliterate cultures can be described both as « traditional » and as « practical »; that is to say, they are are spells, charms or hymns, handed on without verbal change from one generation to another, and regarded and used as furthering or completing some action or process. In more advanced cultures work-songs retain an affinity with this genre; an obvious Greek example is ἄλει μύλα ἄλει, in which the singer feels subconsciously, as her primitive ancestor believed more explicitly, that she speeds the work of the handmill, as one speeds an animal or person, by giving it verbal encouragement. But people do not sing

[1] The preliterate foundations of Archilochean poetry are acknowledged by SNELL, *op. cit.*, 84, LESKY, *op. cit.*, 101, 105, and A. R. BURN, *The Lyric Age of Greece* (London, 1960), 159. A valuable survey of the general characteristics of preliterate poetry is given by C. M. BOWRA, *Primitive Song* (London, 1962), from which many of my examples are drawn.

only when they are trying to hasten the end of necessary work, propitiate a god, bring game to the net, ruin an enemy, or enchant a lover; they also sing while they are waiting, travelling, entertaining friends, or dancing on an occasion which does not demand traditional ritual utterance; and it is with these categories of song — song as self-expression, not song as magic [1] — that I am concerned.

The general characteristics of preliterate song may be summarised as follows:—

1. It very commonly expresses an emotional reaction to an event. This reaction may be fear, shame, rage or despair; the singer may boast; he may lament his rejection in love or deplore his own sexual inadequacy; he may also commiserate with himself or reproach and ridicule himself, his soul or guardian spirit, or other people.

2. The event to which the song is a reaction may be treated as past, so that the song is a narrative; more often, the event is treated as present at the time of singing.

3. Not surprisingly, the song may be addressed to a person, or category of people, whom the composer would often have occasion to address in ordinary life. It is, after

[1] The distinction is not always a sharp one, and its validity might be questioned by the school of linguistic pragmatism of which B. MALINOWSKI, *Coral Gardens and their Magic* (London, 1935), 2.4 ff., 45 ff., is the most persuasive exponent. It is, however, a distinction drawn easily enough for practical purposes in many cultures. Cf. M. VANOVERBERGH, *Anthropos* 55 (1960), 464, on those songs of the Isneg people of Luzon which « could be sung at any time », and R. F. FORTUNE, *Sorcerers of Dobu* (London, 1932), 251: « Every Dobuan is a song-maker. Any interesting event calls forth a number of songs... The song-maker is proud of his creation, proud of its originality... The song-maker must give his permission before his song is used for the dance. Later on it may gain currency in far-away places, for the songs are sung everywhere, on canoes and about the land, after they have been danced to ».

all, normal for us to express our emotional reactions in speech to others, and this characteristic of normal utterance is carried over into song.

4. The emotion expressed in the song is not necessarily that of the composer; he may adopt the personality and standpoint of another person — individual or generic — or, indeed, of two other people in succession or alternately.

5. The event which evokes the emotion is most commonly actual, but may be wholly or in part imaginary.

6. Accurate generalisation about obscenity in preliterate song is not easy, since there is reason to believe that some modern observers have been inhibited in their selection of specimen songs. It is, however, clear that sexual relationships form the context of a very high proportion of preliterate song [1], and precise physical reference is normal, though the language in which such reference is made is oblique and symbolic [2].

7. The song may refer to animals, birds or insects, either as possessing personalities of their own, or as constituent elements in an event with strong emotional associations, or as symbolic of actual persons or categories of people. The sung fable, in which the conversation or interaction of two animals is related, is a special aspect of this general phenomenon [3].

I offer now a selection of examples, each of which illustrates at least one of the characteristics which I have summarised.

1. From the Solomon Islands [4]. A man called Fagalafuna grew frightened when the canoe in which he was sailing

[1] Cf. FORTUNE, *loc. cit.* [2] Cf. VANOVERBERGH, *op. cit.*, 468; note especially the song on pp. 481 ff. [3] On the fable and other types of animal-story cf. K. MEULI, *Herkunft und Wesen der Fabel* (Basel, 1954). [4] G. C. WHEELER, *Mono-Alu Folklore* (London, 1926), 257.

came into very rough water. Another member of the crew afterwards composed a song which began: « Fagalafuna, your body shivers with fright ». The song contains the words: « you, a kindly person, rock the canoe for me », using a verb which in the spoken language is used of a spirit communicating with the living by moving an inanimate object; I take it that this treatment of Fagalafuna as a spirit is sarcastic. At the end of the song we have « I yearn for... » and this is repeated with a variety of persons as its object; it is not clear to me whether the speaker is here describing his own emotions or shifting to what he imagines to have been the standpoint of Fagalafuna in the rough sea.

2. From New Guinea [1]. A song taunting a man called Seduna, who lives on the island of Sanaroa, for making too much fuss when his wife was taken away to another island, contains the words: « Embark and come to sea, Sanaroa mothers. Wishing to marry, they wail, and you, Seduna, wail ». Not all these words describe an actual situation; they are a way of saying two things: (*a*) « the women of Sanaroa wish that they could go and find new husbands, like Seduna's wife », and (*b*) « Seduna is no better than a woman ».

3. Also from New Guinea [2]. A song beginning « I go hillwards to the home of the dead » was composed with reference to a person who had recently died. The first person singular represents the dead man, not the composer of the song.

4. From Hawaii [3]. A song beginning « O my land of rustling trees ! » and continuing in the first person throughout is intended to represent the emotions of a shark at Pearl Harbour homesick for the coast off which it was reared.

[1] FORTUNE, *op. cit.*, 302. [2] FORTUNE, *op. cit.*, 257. [3] CHADWICK, *op. cit.*, 351.

5. From the Vedda people of Ceylon [1]. A mother sang to her children during a thunderstorm a song which includes the words: « See, brother, thunder and lightning coming from seaward; it is getting bad; my body is losing strength ». « Two princes » appear in the song; it is not clear to me how much of it is addressed to them and how much addressed by one of them to the other.

6. From the Andaman Islands [2]. In a song beginning « Thou art sad at heart » the singer expresses his emotions towards a past event by addressing himself as he was at that time.

7. From the South African Bushmen. A cat is imagined as the person uttering the song, and she reports what a lynx said of her. Another Bushman song tells a story about a beetle and a mouse; and there are Eskimo songs which represent a dialogue between a raven and a gull or between a blowfly and a waterbeetle [3].

The characteristics which I have summarised and illustrated are so conspicuous in Archilochos that citation is superfluous — I am sure that many fragments have come into your minds already — and they may be thought adequate evidence for the hypothesis that although Archilochos's poems were more lucid, rational and formally polished than any of my specimens, he drew his inspiration from poetic genres which had existed among the Greeks from time immemorial. But we cannot let the matter rest there. Anthropological data have a value which is both cautionary and suggestive; sometimes they curb the assurance with which we interpret the fragments of archaic poetry, and at other times they prompt positive interpretations which might not have occurred to us without their aid.

[1] BOWRA, *op. cit.*, 67. [2] BOWRA, *op. cit.*, 102. [3] BOWRA, *op. cit.*, 159, 162 ff.

There are four aspects of preliterate song which must affect our interpretation of the fragments of Archilochos. The first three have already been mentioned: that short songs express feelings, that the feelings which a song expresses are not necessarily those of its composer, and that the event or situation which is the object of the feelings expressed is not necessarily actual. The fourth and most important aspect of preliterate songs is that they are composed in comparatively small communities where everyone knows everyone else's business. The majority of the specimens would be unintelligible to us without the helpful explanations provided by the anthropologists who recorded them and knew the circumstances in which they were composed. If we had to treat them as isolated fragments, we should constantly misunderstand their point.

The significance of the fact that songs express feelings is simply that whereas we are entitled to demand consistency of belief from a philosophical poet (subject always to the acknowledgemnt that change of mind is the hallmark of rationality) and consistency of standpoint from the author of a big work which exhibits a distinct architectural design, we cannot expect to find consistency of feeling in a poet who does not even profess to be a systematic thinker. Propositions about the supernatural and generalisations about fate or the nature of human life may be identical in form with informative communications on the weather or the price of fish, but the purpose which they serve, on the lips of most of those who utter them, is the expression of emotional attitudes. When Archilochos says (*Fr.* 7D. 5ff.) « for ills that cannot be healed the gods have created endurance as remedy », or (*Fr.* 64D. 1f.) « when a man has died his fellow-citizens grant him neither respect nor good repute », his words are not in any serious sense contributions to theology or sociology, but the kind of thing we all say to relieve our feelings even when different situations, only a short time before, have evoked

the opposite feelings. This consideration sets a limit to our reconstruction of a poet's system of beliefs[1]. Even so, we could plausibly reconstruct some elements of his biography from the predominant and recurrent notes struck in his work, were it not for those other aspects of preliterate song which I have briefly mentioned and must now discuss more fully: the assumed personality and the imaginary situation.

The *locus classicus* is that passage of *Rhetoric* (1418*b* 23ff.) in which Aristotle says that when it would be an error of taste for a man to speak *in propria persona* he may represent another as speaking for him, « as Isokrates does in *Philippus* and the *Antidosis*, and as Archilochos does in criticising others » (καὶ ὡς Ἀρχίλοχος ψέγει); « for he represents a father as speaking about his daughter[2] in the ἴαμβος 'χρημάτων ἄελπτον οὐδέν ἐστιν οὐδ' ἀπώμοτον' » (*Fr.* 74D.) « and Charon the carpenter in the ἴαμβος of which the beginning is 'οὔ μοι τὰ Γύγεω' » (*Fr.* 22D.). On this passage several observations must be made.

Aristotle tells us explicitly that οὔ μοι τὰ Γύγεω were the opening words of a poem. He does not say this of χρημάτων ἄελπτον κτλ., but it is nevertheless highly

[1] This must be remembered also in the interpretation of narrative and drama. PFEIFFER, *op. cit.*, 49 f., notes a moral and theological difference between *T* 96 ff. and α 32 ff.; but this difference is in no way evidence for a change in Greek ideas; it is the difference between a man excusing his own actions and the gods regarding a man's actions. Cf. Aisch. *Ag.* 1500-1512. [2] I.e. « a man who is the father of a daughter speaking about his daughter »; πατέρα τινά would be doubtful Greek, since πατήρ is one term of a two-term relation, as Plato observes in *Symp.* 199*d*. Alternative interpretations, neither of which seems to me attractive, are: « Archilochos's father speaking about Archilochos's daughter » and « Archilochos's father speaking about Archilochos's father's daughter ». Nor does the identification of the father and daughter as Lykambes and Neobule seem to me persuasive; these two people figured elsewhere in Archilochos's work, but there is never a shortage of fathers and daughters (cf. Arist., *Meteor.*, 356*b*: πρὸς τὸν πορθμέα).

probable; the poem as a whole he regards as an example of ψόγος, but neither the line which he quotes nor the eight following lines (provided by Stobaios) are in themselves ψόγος, nor are they about anyone's daughter, being in fact about an eclipse of the sun and the attitude of mind which that event may properly engender. Had Aristotle wished to select from a poem whose purpose was ψόγος a passage which actually ψέγει, he would surely have made a better choice than the verse χρημάτων ἄελπτον κτλ. I therefore assume that he means not « in that well-known ἴαμβος, when he says χρημάτων ἄελπτον κτλ. » but « in the ἴαμβος 'χρημάτων ἄελπτον κτλ'. », i.e. « the ἴαμβος of which the opening words are χρημάτων ἄελπτον κτλ. ». In two poems of Archilochos, therefore, the opening words represented the utterance of someone other than the poet himself, and in neither case is the hearer warned that this will be so. An interesting parallel is provided by *Fr.* 10LP. of Alkaios, ἔμε δείλαν ἔμε παίσαν κακοτάτων πεδέχοισαν. The poet is not speaking *in propria persona*, since the words agreeing with ἐμέ are feminine; but we know both from the papyrus text and from Hephaistion that this verse was the beginning of a poem [1]. Anakreon *Fr.* 40P. (= *PMG* 385), ἐκ ποταμοῦ 'πανέρχομαι πάντα φέρουσα λαμπρά, where the first person is feminine, may also be the opening line of a poem, since it is quoted as a specimen verse by Hephaistion [2]. How did Aristotle know that the imagined speaker of χρημάτων ἄελπτον κτλ. was the father of a daughter, and that of οὔ μοι τὰ Γύγεω κτλ. Charon the carpenter? The analogy of the second epode of Horace [3], where we learn in line 67 that *fenerator Alfius* has been expressing his feelings to us from the beginning,

[1] Cf. WILAMOWITZ, *Sappho und Simonides*, 305 n. 2, and PAGE, *Sappho and Alcaeus* (Oxford, 1955), 291 ff. [2] I am not quite sure that it is not quoted as a variant *ch ia* ... occuring among *ch ch* ... [3] Cf. EDUARD FRAENKEL, *Horace* (Oxford, 1957), 59 f.

has naturally suggested that somewhere towards the end of οὔ μοι τὰ Γύγεω κτλ. there occurred some such words as « thus spoke Charon the carpenter »[1]. I am not so sure of this. There are, after all, many ways in Greek by which a speaker may tell us his own name — by boasting, prayer, imprecation, and other forms of solemn and emotional utterance, or by reporting, or half-reporting, what others have said or may say to him or about him[2]. The possibility that Charon named himself appears to me to have at least equal status with the alternative possibility that Horace in *Epode 2* is imitating an Archilochean procedure, especially since the disliked and despised profession of Alfius and the ending of Horace's poem strike a note of irony which I cannot see anyway of importing into any reconstruction of Archilochos's poem. As for χρημάτων ἄελπτον κτλ., the possibility that the father who is the imagined speaker neither named himself nor was named by the poet appears to me more probable; for if he was named, why does Aristotle not name him too?

Now, since in preliterate cultures the person whose emotions are expressed in a song is commonly identified not by any words of the song itself but by the community's knowledge of the entire context of the song, it would not surprise me if some of the poems of Archilochos and of other early Greek poets were of this kind. Indeed, it would surprise me more if they were not. I am not shaken in this view by Horace. A procedure which would be natural in a citizen of an Aegean island community in the seventh century B.C. would cease to be natural to the poet or acceptable to his audience long before the age of Augustus. It would cease to be natural, in fact, before the age of Perikles. This reflection must make us wonder whether Aristotle was

[1] Hence *Fr.* 19LB. [2] E. g. A 240, Pl. *Euthphr.* 4*e*-5*a*, *Ap.* 23*c*, 26*e*, Ar. *Th.* 77.

right in thinking that in *Fr.* 22D. and 74D. Archilochos was employing a literary device for the expression of *his own* views. It is also of some importance for our assessment of Kritias's famous judgment on Archilochos [1]. Kritias said (*Fr.* 44DK.) that we should not have known so much to the discredit of Archilochos if the poet had not told us himself, for example, that he was a lecherous adulterer and that he had thrown away his shield. How far was Kritias right? And how far are we today right when we assume, unless we have positive evidence to the contrary, that whenever a fragment of an early Greek poet contains a first person singular it comes from a genuinely autobiographical poem? Are we sure — to take a crucial example — that Archilochos himself threw away his shield in combat against the Saioi? I put this question because consideration of preliterate song has left me no longer sure. But in case anyone still feels that data derived from cultures greatly inferior in material development, organisation and rationality to archaic Greece are irrelevant, it is not impossible to base a similar plea on Greek data alone. I cited earlier a fragment of Alkaios and one of Anakreon. These came into the question solely because they exhibit feminine participles and adjectives in agreement with a first person singular and thus indicate beyond doubt that the poet is assuming a personality other than his own. But if and when the poet assumed a personality which was male but still not his own, should we expect that the poem — let alone a line or two cited from it by metricians or anthologists — would reveal to us that it was not autobiographical? Even if the poet declared his hand as Horace does, the bare citations which constitute most of our knowledge of early Greek lyric would not tell us whether or not he declared it. A similar consideration is

[1] Cf. TREU, *Archilochos*, 156 ff., on the Greeks' attitude to Archilochos and their predilection for moral judgments on poets.

raised by two more fragments of Anakreon (*PMG* 376, 378), both cited by Hephaistion as specimens of verse-forms, which say respectively (376) « Now I have launched myself from the White Cliff and dive into the grey sea, drunk with passion » and (378) « I fly towards Olympos on light wings ». In both cases the nature of what is said proves that the poet is envisaging an imaginary situation; but if and when he envisaged a situation which, although equally imaginary to him at the time of composition, is physically possible or even commonplace — e.g. elaboration of the themes « I am angry », « I am lonely » or « I am in love » — how could the ancients know, and how could we know from the type of citation on which we have to depend, whether the situation was actual or not?

The approach to the fragments of Archilochos which I am by now implicitly advocating is open to two objections, both of which are, in my submission, insufficient.

First, it may be said: surely a poet would not risk ill fame by composing in the first person singular songs which did not actually refer to his own experience but might be interpreted as doing so. The answer to this objection is that everything depends on the conventions of the society in which he lives. If the first person in a song is generally taken to refer to the poet, then obviously he will not risk damage to his own reputation. If, on the other hand, it has been accepted for generations — as it is accepted in so many preliterate cultures — that a poet in making a song may assume any personality he likes, the possibility that all his songs will be taken to refer to him will not occur to him. The community in which he composes a song knows its context; other communities in which it is sung will not know or care who composed it, nor will they necessarily know or care what its original point and meaning were [1].

[1] Cf. p. 201, n. 1.

The spread of literacy is likely to change this attitude [1]. As a poet becomes accustomed to the idea that his songs will be known in many different communities, now and in the future, not simply as good songs but as *his* songs, and that when collected and transmitted they will represent *him* to posterity and will compete powerfully with the oral tradition of his valour in battle and other virtues, a new concept of the relation between his own personality and the whole body of his work will form itself in his mind [2]. Of course this concept was already present and active in Greek society in the time of Archilochos. My argument is that it coexisted and competed with a different concept, that a song, once composed and sung to people who knew its composer and the circumstances of its composition, drifted loose, as it were, from its composer. In Greek society the problem is complicated by the existence of a third concept, that of the poet as moral teacher. The balance between these different concepts was not the same for any two genres of poetry, nor was it the same for any two periods or regions. My concern is to rescue from neglect a primitive concept which seems to me of fundamental importance for the interpretation of songs composed in a period of transition from preliteracy to literacy.

The second objection is that my approach to the fragments is more than cautious; it is agnostic to the point of nihilism, and if it is valid it implies that we no longer know about Archilochos many things which, in common with the Greeks themselves from the Classical period onwards, we have always believed that we knew. Part of the answer to this objection is Plato's: we must go where the wind of reason blows, however barren the shore upon which it casts us. For my part, I would be content if I were able to demolish some portion of what has lately been built upon such foundations as the fragments of Archilochus provide.

[1] Cf. BURN, *op. cit.*, 160 f. [2] Cf. Theognis 19 ff.

I can, however, offer a less uncompromising answer. I do not suggest, or believe, that the fragments in which Glaukos or Perikles is addressed express emotions other than those of the poet himself. I do suggest that the poet's own standpoint is only one among the standpoints which he adopted in the composition of poetry. The fragments may tell us less of Archilochos's own life than we thought they did; but they tell us no less than before what standpoints he preferred to adopt, what emotions he preferred to express, and what topics he preferred to develop; and these are the elements which compose his personality as an artist.

DISCUSSION

M. Wistrand: May I take up a question which relates also to the lecture and discussions of yesterday and the day before? Archilochus' language is, on the whole, the traditional epic language, as Mr. Page emphasized yesterday. There is, however, a certain amount of independence, in that the non-Ionic elements of epic language are, generally, avoided. Mr. Scherer made a point of that in his lecture. Now this seems to me to be a remarkable fact, for surely Archilochus mastered the whole of the epic language and could have used any part of it if he had wanted to. I had thought that for an archaic poet there was one great linguistic distinction, that between his own vernacular which he learnt in his everyday life, and the poetic language which he learnt in the school of the epic poets. But now it seems that for Archilochus the line of demarcation is between non-Ionic epic language on the one hand and on the other hand the Ionic dialect both as it appeared in the epics and as it was used in daily speech. This union of epic and contemporary Ionic would be much easier to understand if we accept Mr. Dover's view that the gap between epic language and contemporary Ionic was considerably less than it is generally supposed to be, because many of the words and forms which the chance of transmission make us regard as exclusively Homeric may in fact have lived on in archaic time; they may have existed in the folk-songs which Mr. Dover has dealt with to-day. I should very much like to believe that Archilochus, when he spoke about himself and addressed his fellow-citizens, employed a language which he felt to be his own language, and not « die epische Kunstsprache ».

M. Dover: My view of the « gap » between epic language and the language of Archilochus is largely determined by the fact that although there are so few archaic Ionic inscriptions they so often present us with words which in literature are known only from epic or early Ionic poetry. These inscriptions show us, moreover,

many words which do not occur in extant literature at all, but which, if we found them in a papyrus and not in an inscription, we should call « poetic ». Therefore I always assume that a word found in early poetry belongs to the spoken language of the time, unless we have positive evidence—as we sometimes have—to the contrary.

I do not want to draw upon ethnological material to excess, but I must mention the fact that in many primitive cultures there exist songs composed entirely in archaic dialect, and when new songs are composed they draw upon this dialect in varying degrees—and indeed upon neighbouring languages feeling, that this kind of « seasoning » is appropriate to poetry.

As for folksongs: some of these transmitted to us in Greek may be very old, but I am not sure which ones. For that reason I thought it best not to cite any; I do not want to complicate the issue by introducing songs which may be influenced by literature.

M. Page: On the first part of his paper, I should like to ask Professor Dover for further enlightenment on two points. First, does he exclude the possibility that elegiac poetry may have developed independently in Ionia and in the Peloponnese, going different ways, though perhaps originally from some common source? Secondly, on the fragment οὐ φιλέω μέγαν στρατηγόν, is not this very much in the spirit of Homer? The descriptions of Tydeus and Irus are essentially the same; and it is to be noticed that when Homer wishes to describe a particular individual, such as Thersites, he does just what Archilochus is doing,—he uses a detailed and highly specialized vocabulary, including numerous ἅπαξ εἰρημένα.

On poems of the type of Charon the Carpenter: I suggest that the comparable examples in Alcaeus and Anacreon were in fact recited by women and written for that purpose. The entertainment of his friends by the poet at a symposium may well include not only an αὐλητρίς but also a female colleague who recites a poem specially composed for the occasion.

The examples from Archilochus are of a different type. In the case of Charon, Professor Dover allowed that there may have been an explicit statement or indication of the speaker's identity; but he seemed to suggest that there may have been no such indication in the piece quoted by Aristotle. I find this rather hard to accept, and in fact I wonder if the lines following those quoted by Aristotle may not give the name of the father, Ἀρχηνακτίδης, and a reference to the daughter, πάις, together perhaps with an indication of the cause of the trouble, γάμος.

Professor Dover's final observations are of the highest importance. No doubt Critias thought he could quote Archilochus himself to prove that the poet was the son of a slave-mother: but we must reckon with the possibility that this and other statements are founded on poems which had nothing to do with Archilochus himself.

M. Dover: 1. I have certainly considered the possibility that elegy developed independently in two different regions, but the morphology and phonology of Tyrtaios, especially when contrasted with what happens in verse inscriptions, seem to me to rule it out. Of course, if Tyrtaios was not a Spartan, the whole problem assumes a different complexion; but I think he was.

2. I agree that there is much that is Homeric in οὐ φιλέω μέγαν στρατηγόν. In summarising two opposing hypotheses I mentioned the fragments which have in fact formed the basis of arguments.

3. In χρημάτων ἄελπτον it is possible that Aristotle's interpretation was based simply on the occurrence, somewhere in the poem, of the words « my daughter ». Perhaps he believed that Archilochus had no daughter; perhaps he was right. Of course Charon must have been named somehow in οὔ μοι τὰ Γυγέω. I am very interested indeed in the suggestion that ἔμε δείλαν and ἐκ ποταμοῦ may actually have been sung by women; but in this connection I should like to mention the possibility that there was a much greater mimetic element in the singing of poems than

we know about. Miming in character is extremely common in the performance of primitive song, and the words naturally do not betray this.

4. In the interpretation of any fragment whatsoever of Greek poetry we must ask: do we know who is speaking, and in what connection? Usually the answer is « no ». Sometimes we may learn something from the Greek quoter who had the entire poem before him and could see obvious things in it which we cannot; but a situation in which a Greek is drawing on biographical anecdotes for his own interpretation of the fragment is something of which we must beware.

M. Pouilloux: Le scepticisme dont M. Dover témoigne à propos des renseignements que nous apporte Archiloque sur sa vie et les événements de son temps me paraît particulièrement précieux. Les historiens m'ont en effet reproché parfois de ne pas assez demander aux fragments d'Archiloque pour reconstruire l'histoire primitive de la colonisation thasienne. Je dois avouer qu'en présence de certaines reconstructions extrêmement ingénieuses (mais combien fragiles !), j'ai toujours eu une certaine timidité. Aujourd'hui, après avoir entendu M. Dover, j'ai peur non plus de n'en avoir pas assez dit, mais d'en avoir trop dit. Je partage entièrement sa manière de voir pour aborder l'utilisation historique des fragments. Puisque, d'autre part, M. Dover a abordé la question des inscriptions métriques archaïques, je voudrais simplement lui poser une question, ainsi qu'aux philologues et métriciens qui sont ici: lorsque j'ai publié l'inscription du *mnèma* de Glaucos, je n'ai pas cru pouvoir la ranger parmi les inscriptions métriques. Or W. Peek la tient pour telle puisqu'il l'a publiée dans l'addendum à ses *Grab-Versinschriften I.* Pensez-vous que l'on puisse, sans altérer le texte, donner une forme métrique satisfaisante à cette inscription ?

Sur un autre point, l'exposé de M. Dover, comme d'ailleurs celui de M. Page hier, me paraît soulever une question. Sans doute M. Kontoleon nous a-t-il montré qu'en raison des rapports très étroits entre Paros et Milet, Archiloque appartenait encore au

monde ionien et « homérique ». Les exposés d'hier et d'aujourd'hui, en attirant l'attention sur la communauté du langage, insistent encore davantage sur cette appartenance. Et pourtant, entre l'art géométrique du VIII^e siècle en son début, et l'art ionien qui paraît sur la céramique des années 650 à Thasos, la différence est considérable, comme s'il y avait eu tout à coup, non pas une conquête technique — la technique des potiers de l'époque géométrique atteignait une véritable perfection de formes et de combinaisons linéaires — mais une révolution dans l'esprit même de cette décoration. Il y a une quinzaine d'années, M. P. de La Coste-Messelière, dans une communication à l'Académie des Inscriptions, s'était attaché à montrer que les décorateurs des vases géométriques avaient été enfermés dans un véritable carcan de conventions et d'interdictions; en 650, cette barrière de défenses et de craintes est assurément levée. Or tout se passe comme si, en littérature, cette différence n'existait pas. Est-il possible d'en discerner les raisons ?

Reste enfin la question, toujours reprise depuis le début du siècle, de la créance que l'on peut donner aux comparaisons tirées de l'étude des civilisations dites primitives et de leurs créations. Ne s'agit-il pas toujours, dans ces créations, de poèmes relativement courts et d'un formulaire assez limité ? Même si on estime qu'Archiloque suit à sa manière un courant de chanson populaire, les conditions n'étaient-elles pas radicalement différentes par le seul fait qu'il avait derrière lui Homère et Hésiode. Même s'il n'a été à l'origine qu'un créateur parmi d'autres, et dont les œuvres ont survécu seulement parce qu'elles étaient meilleures, la seule présence de la poésie homérique, lui fournissant comme la matière première de son expression et de sa technique, ne modifie-t-elle pas absolument les données ? Même si la méthode comparative peut apporter des indications sur les formes de littérature liées à un mode de société donnée, ne croyez-vous pas qu'il serait dangereux de vouloir pousser trop avant cette comparaison, de vouloir y trouver des raisons déterminantes pour expliquer la poésie grecque du VII^e siècle ?

M. Dover: I certainly cannot scan the Glaukos inscription. There are inscriptions which contain a single metrical phrase, and one may be in doubt about the composer's intention; but the Glaukos inscription seems to me undoubtedly prose.

I would rather not express any opinion on the relation between developments in poetry and developments in the visual arts. It is possible, after all, for different arts to develop independently and even in different directions.

I do realize that the Parians were not savages, and certainly the cultures to which I have referred compose songs on a smaller scale than Archilochus. Certainly, too, Archilochus had Homer and Hesiod behind him; I want to emphasize that he *also* had a tradition of popular song behind him.

M. Treu: Mit sehr viel besseren Argumenten als je zuvor wurde gezeigt, dass Tyrtaios von Homer abhängig ist, nicht umgekehrt. Auch dass nun vom Ethos des Dichters gesprochen wurde, freut mich besonders. Ich stimme der Datierung des Kallinos und Archilochos in die gleiche Zeit gern zu; Strabons Satz darf nicht dahin gedeutet werden, dass Kallinos einer anderen Generation angehöre. Stilunterschiede und thematische Unterschiede zwischen Elegien und Iamben habe auch ich bei Archilochos noch nicht finden können, möchte aber doch fragen, ob nicht manche Themen einem Genos vorbehalten bleiben, die Tierfabeln z.B. den Epoden (fast nur ihnen). Bei aller Gleichzeitigkeit von Iamben und Elegien in Inschriften glaubte Friedländer lokale Unterschiede annehmen zu können, näml. Fehlen iambischer Inschriften in einigen Gebieten (war es Korinth?). Bei Paus. X 7,4 ist das Epigramm und die historische Tatsache authentisch; wenn er die Aulodie düster nennt, so ist dem wie allen Motivierungen gegenüber Skepsis am Platz. Bezeugt ist threnodische Elegie für die Peloponnes nicht. Die Frage der Herkunft der Tierfabeln wurde nicht berührt und ist ja auch kaum zu beantworten; kommt die Fabel, wie ich anzunehmen geneigt bin, aus dem Osten, so rückt — nach Prof. Kontoleons Ausführungen — Milet in den Vordergrund. Dass Prof. Dover

Material aus Volksliedern anderer Völker heranzog, freute mich ganz besonders. Das lettische Volkslied war in meiner Heimat noch durchaus lebendig; manches ist mir von dort vertraut, Wenn bezweifelt wurde, ob das Charon-Gedicht (22 D.) einen paradoxen Schluss gehabt haben könne, ob Archilochos Ironie kenne, so hätte hier durch einen Vergleich mit Volkstümlichem der Zweifel gemindert werden können, — auch wenn man von H. Fränkels Rekonstruktionsversuch absieht (Tr. p. 198 f.). Es gibt in vielen Sprachen das sog. epilogische Witzwort; eine schöne Sentenz wie « Immer feste druff! », durch das Folgende — « sprach der Hahn und stieg von der Henne » — hinterher zum komischen Paradoxon umgekehrt. Dass sog. mimetische Lieder entsprechender Kostümierung bedürfen oder als Aussagen von Mädchen vorgetragen zu denken sind, bestreite ich. Bei einer solchen Annahme würde übrigens — wenn wir uns nicht den Dichter selbst als χοροδιδάσκαλος vorstellen — am Rande die Frage der Schriftlichkeit erneut auftauchen.

Mit « the song became artistically respectable » wurde das Hauptproblem berührt. Es konnte scheinen, als bestünde nun eine besondere Schwierigkeit, zu unterscheiden zwischen imagined and actual situation, zwischen mimetischem Pseudo-Ich und echter, persönlicher Selbstaussage. Dass es in nicht wenigen Fällen gar keinen Zweifel für mich gibt, dafür sei τὸ πρὶν ἑταῖρος ἐών [79 a D.] nur ein Beispiel. Musen sind übrigens durch anthropologisches Vergleichsmaterial sonst nicht zu belegen; sie sind nicht aus dem volkstümlichen Lied entlehnt.

M. Dover: The animal fables of Archilochus seem to have been composed only in epodic metres; my remarks on the essential community of ethos between his elegies and other genres were based on the fact that all the elements of the former are to be found in the latter, not vice-versa.

In saying what I did about Echembrotos and Sakadas I assumed that enough was known about their work to afford a basis for the motivation which Pausanias suggests.

I avoided reference to European or Near Eastern folksong

because of the possibilities, however remote, that it might have been influenced by the diffusion of Greek motifs and artforms.

I am very grateful for the information that a paradoxical ending is common in popular proverbs. In what I said about οὔ μοι τὰ Γύγεω, I meant simply that it is very difficult to give it the point which Horace's *Epode 2* has.

By « making songs artistically respectable » I meant that the fact that Archilochos did not express his poetic genius by composing epic must be taken fully into account by anyone who wishes to deny any development of ideas during the seventh century.

Most certainly κύμασι πλαζόμενος... τὸ πρὶν ἑταῖρος ἐών expresses the emotions of the poet himself.

The community in which and for which Archilochus composed was not the whole of Paros, or of Thasos, but simply the people he knew.

M. Bühler: Eben war davon die Rede, dass Fabeln bei Archilochos nur in den Epoden vorkämen. Eine Gegeninstanz in *Fr.* 48 D. (in den Jamben). Ein Wort noch zur Bedeutung von ἴαμβος im *Fr.* 20 D. Herr Dover hat davor gewarnt, dass wir den späteren Gebrauch im metrischen Sinn ohne weiteres auf die Frühzeit rückprojizieren. Er hat auch Zeugnisse dafür angeführt, dass das Wort auf trochaïsche Tetrameter und Hinkiamben angewendet wurde. Dieser Gebrauch scheint mir nicht so ungewöhnlich, da das trochaïsche und das iambische Versmass tatsächlich etwas Gemeinsames haben. Ich kann aber immer noch nicht recht glauben, dass das Wort ἴαμβος je in Bezug auf Distichen gebraucht wurde.

M. Dover: The interpretation of οὔτ' ἰάμβων οὔτε τερπωλέων is so full of ambiguity that we must leave open the possibility that for Archilochus the term ἴαμβοι includes elegiac poems.

M. Treu: Horaz nennt seine Epoden *iambi*, Theocr. (*Epigr.* XXI) unterscheidet bei Archilochos Iamben und Elegien (ἔπεα).

M. Page: I should like to raise the question whether anybody can explain to me why this kind of personal poetry had so short

a life in Greece. It begins with Archilochus and ends with Anacreon. It never existed again; in Athens it never existed at all. Personal loves and hates and experiences are never again expressed in lyrical or iambic metre, except on a very small scale in the Hellenistic period. So far as this kind of personal poetry ever does recur, it is conveyed by a different channel, the Epigram.

M. Treu: Ein einzigartiges, ja erschütterndes Phänomen ist das Ende der persönlichen Lyrik bei den Griechen (oder sollte man lieber sagen, ihr Zurückkehren in den Schoss des Volkes ?). Aber was von ihrem Ende gesagt wurde, gilt auch von ihrem Anfang.

M. Snell: Es ist vielleicht zu bedenken, dass die archaische Lyrik nicht ganz so « persönlich » ist, wie wir zunächst annehmen, da das, was wir « persönlich » nennen, noch stark als Einwirken der Gottheit gefasst wurde (Archilochos: Ares und Musen, Sappho: Aphrodite usw.). Die Sublimierung der Götter machte die Götter zu erhaben, als dass man in ernster Poesie solch ein Eingreifen darstellte. Auch die Skulptur zeigt, dass « grosse » Kunst von dieser Art des « Persönlichen » absieht. Hier liegt ein Grundproblem der « Klassik ».

M. Treu: Sehen können wir, — um zunächst beim Feststellbaren zu bleiben, — wie ein Zweig der Lyrik, die Chorlyrik, bei Alkman in hohem Masse fähig, auch persönliches Sentiment auszudrücken, den Weg zum Dithyrambischen einschlägt. Sie lebt in der Tragödie weiter. Sehen können wir, wie im Hellenismus das pointierte Epigramm ein Ersatz für die Lyrik geworden ist — und wie Theokrit aus der Lyrik den Refrain aufnimmt in hexametrische Dichtung.

M. Dover: Would it be possible to call Empedokles a « personal » poet ? The most trivial circumstances may cause a change of fashion; we cannot always expect to know the reasons.

There is a splendid example of a love song in the *Ecclesiazusae* (δεῦρο δὴ δεῦρο δή) through which we may glimpse non-literary « personal » poetry in the classical period.

M. Treu: Das Volkslied stirbt am Schlager: alles, was stirbt, stirbt an etwas. Aufs Ganze gesehen, erliegt die Tragödie der

Philosophie. Lange zuvor war die persönliche Lyrik der Tragödie erlegen (mag auch scheinbar eine zeitliche Lücke bleiben). Den sozialen und politischen Verhältnissen ist diese geistige Entwicklung vorausgeeilt; die Tragödie ist der attischen Demokratie voraus.

M. Wistrand: In der lateinischen Literatur erwacht die persönliche Liebespoesie bekanntlich zu einem neuen Leben. Dabei ist es doch eine Frage, wie ernst diese Dichtung als persönliches Bekenntnis zu nehmen ist. Mit Sicherheit möchte ich das eigentlich nur für Catull zu behaupten wagen. Bei ihm hat man sogar das Gefühl, dass ein Gedicht wie 76 *Si qua recordanti* malgré lui entstanden ist, weil die Gefühle zum Ausdruck drängten, während sein eigentlicher Kunstwille eher in den grossen Gedichten zu sehen ist.

M. Page: Sincerity in love-poetry is surely to be found in Propertius almost if not quite as much as in Catullus.

M. Bühler: Auch bei den Epigrammen ist es oft schwer, den Anteil des Persönlichem von dem des Künstlerische und Sprachlichen zu unterscheiden.

M. Dover: Even if Latin love elegy were not « serious », it would still be an important art-form.