

THE PERFORMANCE CONTEXTS OF TROCHAIC TETRAMETERS CATALECTIC

Ewen Bowie*

* Corpus Christi
College, Oxford.

Recebido em: 17/11/2018

Aprovado em: 14/12/2018

ewen.bowie@ccc.ox.ac.uk



ABSTRACT: The paper explores the evidence for the archaic performance context or contexts of Archilochus' and Solon's trochaic tetrameter catalectic poems, noting that they were chanted rather than sung or spoken and thus different from both elegy and iambic trimeters. It argues that in Archilochus' fragments apparently lengthy battle-narratives, concern with the *polis* as a whole, and addresses to elite individuals point to their first audience being a formal gathering of warrior-citizens, perhaps before a battle, or perhaps at a mass cremation following a battle such as that attested by the late-eighth-century *polyandria* in Paroikia. It is suggested that Solon's very political tetrameters may also have been addressed to a formal citizen assembly, with possible reperformance at the *Apatouria*.

KEYWORDS: Archilochus; *aulos*; cremation; elegy; *epitaphios*; inscription; military; Paros; *rhapsodia*; Solon; tetrameter; Thasos; trochaic.

OS CONTEXTOS DE PERFORMANCE DOS TETRÂMETROS TROCAICOS CATALÉTICOS

RESUMO: O artigo explora a evidência do contexto ou dos contextos da performance arcaica dos poemas em tetrâmetro trocaico catalético de Arquíloco e Sólon, observando que eram entoados mais do que cantados ou falados e, portanto, diferentes tanto da elegia quanto dos trímetros iâmbicos. Argumenta-se que, nos fragmentos de Arquíloco, narrativas de batalhas aparentemente longas, preocupação com a *polis* como um todo e falas dirigidas a indivíduos da elite apontam para a hipótese de que a sua primeira audiência era um encontro formal de cidadãos-guerreiros, talvez antes de uma batalha, ou talvez em uma cerimônia de cremação em massa que se seguia a uma batalha, tal como a atestada pelo *polyandria* do final do século oito em Paroikia. É sugerido que os próprios tetrâmetros políticos de Sólon também podem ter sido dirigidos a uma assembleia formal de cidadãos, com possível repetição de performance na *Apatouria*.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Arquíloco; *aulos*; cremação; elegia; *epitaphios*; inscrição; militar; Paros; *rhapsodia*; Sólon; tetrâmetro; Thasos; trocaico.



INTRODUCTION

In this paper I explore the meagre evidence for the archaic performance context or contexts of poems in the metre that modern scholars (following metricians of the Hellenistic and Roman periods) call the trochaic tetrameter catalectic.¹ Some features of these trochaic tetrameters might support the view that their performance contexts were different from those of other early verse forms – from those of melic poetry (always sung), of elegiac poetry (either sung or perhaps chanted),² and of iambic trimeters (usually spoken, not sung) to which they are metrically close.³

I begin with a brief discussion of this last feature, the place on the spectrum between spoken and sung performance occupied by tetrameters. It seems that when trochaic tetrameters catalectic were composed and performed *κατὰ στίχον* (i.e. in successive lines in the same metre)⁴ they were chanted, rather than sung or simply spoken: the ancient term is *παρακαταλογή*.⁵ It may be a consequence of the fact that they are ‘chanted’, rather than spoken, that they later have a strong presence in fifth-century Attic tragedy for stately speeches by serious characters, and in fifth-century Attic comedy for the sections of the *parabasis* that were not sung. These presences in turn might deserve to be taken into account in assessing archaic performance context.

Two other features that may be fruitful for determining performance context are (a) that some poems in this metre were addressed to elite citizens (though of course that was also the case for much elegiac and iambic poetry apparently performed in the symposium); and (b) that some both have a content that concerns the whole *polis* and a perspective that identifies itself with that of the *polis* as a whole, and not just (like much elegiac and iambic trimeter poetry) the perspective of a sympotic group. Of course some elegiac and iambic poetry does indeed address the good of the *polis*, and sometimes the perspective of the performer is aligned with that of the *polis*.⁶ But often both singer and immediate audience seem to stand outside the *polis* rather than being presented as an integral part of it.⁷

¹ I am very grateful to Elizabeth Irwin for helpful criticism of an earlier draft of this paper.

² For arguments in favour of the view that elegiac poetry was not sung but delivered in some mode intermediate between speech and song see Budelmann and Power (2013).

³ But not as close as suggested by West (1980, p. 40), as has been pointed out e.g. by Sicking (1981, p. 427).

⁴ The metre can also be found in melic metrical systems, e.g. in Alcman’s first *Partheneion*, and in these the lines in this metre will have been sung just like adjacent lines in different metres.

⁵ [Plut.] *De Musica* 28 = *Mor.* 1141a. Note the self-referential *ἄειδε* in the tetrameter fr. 117 of Archilochus (discussed below), and the *ἄειδε* of the tetrameter of Simonides fr. 92.2 (in West, 1992 = fr. 17. 2 in West, 1972) = *Anth. Pal.* 13.30.2. Self-referential uses of *ἄειδεν* are frequent in elegy, often with the phrase *ὑπ’ ἀλιητῆρος* (e.g. *Theognidea* 533), but the only appearance of *ἄειδεν* in trimeter fragments (Archilochus fr.58.12 *ἄιδων ὑπ’ ἀλιητῆρος*) has little claim to being self-referential.

⁶ This is especially true of Solon (Irwin, 2005); but see also, e.g., *Theognidea* 757-64, 773-88, perhaps 453-56.

⁷ E.g. Archilochus 13, Mimnermus fr. 7 (= *Theognidea* 795-6), Theognis 39-52, 53-68, 219-20, 541-542, *Theognidea* 287-92, 603-4. All fragment numbers of Archilochus, Hipponax, Mimnermus and Solon

ARCHILOCHUS

By far our largest surviving body of trochaic tetrameters is attributed to Archilochus, and it seems to me that the text of these tetrameters offers some clues.

On the one hand, some of Archilochus' trochaic tetrameters, like many of his iambic trimeters and some of his epodes, are sexual narratives which it is tempting to allocate to some sort of sympotic performance, like fr. 118 and fr. 119,⁸ or they concern his quarrel with Lycambes, like fr. 122:⁹ i.e. they are very much focussed on his personal life, whether real or constructed.

But the combination of papyri and inscriptions, above all, the two magnificent inscriptions from Paros,¹⁰ have established that there were long poems narrating battles between Parians and other contenders for control of land in the *peraea* along the Thracian coast opposite their colony on Thasos – Thracians, Naxians and perhaps Lesbians.¹¹ The fragments of these poems repeatedly use first person plural verbs to describe the actions of the Parian fighters,¹² and seem very much to adopt a *polis* perspective. They memorialise the fighters' achievements in a way that makes this poetry as important a forerunner of historiography as early narrative elegy.¹³ Indeed they offered enough information for Archilochus' admirer Mnesiepes in the third century BC,¹⁴ and the local historian Demeas, as cited by Sosthenes in the first century BC,¹⁵ to attempt to construct a historical narrative – a narrative in which Demeas thought he could attach different events to different archons.¹⁶ This is something to which I return.

But the poems are not simply narrative. The mixture of narrative, reflection and exhortation is well brought out by the following lines (= fr. 89.1-18, 26-30) which I print together with the prose text of Mnesiepes which introduces them.¹⁷ The passage is chiefly

refer to the numeration of West (1971-1972). For arguments that Archilochus used his epodic poetry to attack political enemies see Bowie (2008).

⁸ Fr. 118 runs εἰ γὰρ ὡς ἐμοὶ γένοιτο χεῖρα Νεοβούλης θηγεῖν; fr. 119 runs καὶ πεσεῖν δρήστην ἐπ' ἀσκόν, κάπῃ γαστρὶ γαστέρα / προσβαλεῖν μηρούς τε μηροῖς.

⁹ The 17 lines of fr. 122 begin χρημάτων ἄελπτων οὐδέν ἐστιν οὐδ' ἀπόμοτον. For discussion of whether it is right to link this fragment with Archilochus' quarrel with Lycambes (as is usually done) see Bowie (2008).

¹⁰ For these inscriptions and the light they cast on the cult of Archilochus at Paros see above all Clay (2004).

¹¹ Thracians, fr. 93a.6 (= *IG* xii 5 445 A I 49, cf. fr. 93b = Paus. 7.10.6); Naxians, fr. 89.6 (= *SEG* 15.517 B I 10), fr. 94 (= *IG* xii 5 445 A I 54); Lesbians fr. 98.11W (= *IG* xii 5 445 A IV 12).

¹² Fr. 98.10 and 14, fr. 101.1, fr. 106.2 and 4.

¹³ For the importance of elegy as a predecessor of historiography see Bowie, 2001; Bowie, 2010; Bowie, 2018.

¹⁴ *SEG* 15.517.

¹⁵ *IG* xii 5.445 = *SEG* 17.518.

¹⁶ Fr. 192W = *IG* xii 5.445.7-9.

¹⁷ I.e. *SEG* 15.517 B I 4-47.

narrative, but reflection is found at fr. 89.14-15, and the imperative γνῶθι νῦν at fr. 89.17 supports Mnesiepes' reading of what he goes on to cite as exhortatory.¹⁸

πολέμου γάρ ποτε ἡμῖν πρὸς τοὺς Να]- ξίους ἰσχυροῦ ὄντος κ - - - - -	5
μένα ὑπὸ τῶν πολ[ι]τῶ[ν]- - - - - ῥή]- μασι περὶ αὐτῶν[- - - - - φανερόν ποιῆ]- σας, ὡς ἔχει πρὸ[ς]- - - - - καὶ τὴν σωτηρίαν τῆς] πατρίδος καὶ ὑπ[ὸ]- - - - -]	
καὶ ἐνεφάνισεν	1
εἰν καὶ παρεκάλε[σεν αὐτοὺς- - - - -] βοηθεῖν ἀπροφασ[ίστως- - - - -] · καὶ λέγει περὶ αὐτῶν [ἐν τῇ ποιήσει ? - - - καὶ ταύ]- της νῦν πάντες [μέμνηται ?- - - - -]	
ἀμφικαπνίουσιν [ἄστν, δεῦρ' ἐπελθόντες θοαῖς] =	1 of fr. 89
νηυσίν, ὀξεῖται δ' [- - - - - βοαῖ] δηίων, ἀυαίνετ[αι δὲ - - - - -] ἡλίωι, θράσος τε - - - - -	
οἱ μέγ' ἰμείροντες [ἔργον(?)- - - - -]	5 of fr.89
Ναξίωιν δῦναι φέ[ροντο- - - - -] καὶ φυτῶν τομῆν λ - - - - -	
ἄνδρες ἰσχυοσιν δ[έ κείνους, θῆλυν οἱ δεῖξαν νόον], τοῦτό κεν λεῶι μ[εγίστην αὐτίκ' αἰσχύνην φέροι] · ὡς ἀμνητεῖ παρ' ἡ[μῶν τοιάδ' οὐ δεχθήσεται],	10
καὶ κασιγνήτων [δὲ μοῖραν ἐντίθημί σοι φρεσίν], τέων ἀπέθρισαν - - - - -	
ἤριπεν πληγῆισι, δο[ῦπος δ' ἀμόρωρ' ἐπὶ χθονός]. ταῦτά μοι θυμὸς χο[λωθεῖς εἰσιδόντ' ὠρίνετο]	
νειόθεν, φόβον δὲ [μεστοὶ καὶ τότε ἦσαν οἱ φίλοι].	15
ἀλλ' ὅμως θανόν[τας οὐ χρῆ νωλεμέσ στεναζέμεν]. γνῶθι νῦν, εἴ τοι [δικαίως, Ἐρξίη, ταράσσομαι] ρήμαθ' ὃς μέλλε[ις ἀκούσειν, ὦ φίλ', ἐλπίδας πάρα] ·	
....	
ἐμ προαστίωι κε[χληδὸς - - - - -] γῆν ἀεικίζουσιν [ἡμ]έων - - - - -	
Ἐρξίη, καταδραμ[εῖται πάντα δὴ πόλει κακά]·	28
τῶ' ς ὄδον στελλ[α] μηδὲ δεξίους επ[ι]	30
εὐχομένωι οὖν [- - - - - ἐπήκ]ουσαν οἱ θεοὶ καὶ [. . .	

¹⁸ καὶ παρεκάλε[σεν αὐτοὺς- - - - -]/βοηθεῖν ἀπροφασ[ίστως- - - - -], *SEG* 15.517 B I 11-12. I print the text with the supplements accepted by the editors of *SEG* 15, based on the *editio princeps* of Kondoleon (1952), the thorough discussion by Peek (1955) and the further suggestions of Peek (1956).

Imperatives are also found in fr.105.1 (Γλαῦχ', ὄρα· βαθὺς γὰρ ἤδη κόμασιν ταρασσεται / πόντος), and first person exhortatory subjunctives alongside second person imperatives in fr. 106:

[]νται νῆες ἐν πόντῳ θαί
 [π]ολλὸν δ' ἰστίων ὑφώμεθα
 λύσαν]τες ὄπλα νηός· οὐρίην δ' ἔχε
 []ρους, ὄφρα σεο μεμνέωμεθα
 []ἄπισχε, μηδὲ τοῦτον ἐμβάλῃς 5
 []ν ἴσταται κυκώμενον[
]χῆς· ἀλλὰ σὺ προμήθεσα
 []υμος

An exhortation similar to the γνῶθι νυν of fr. 89 is found in fr. 113.7-9:¹⁹

ἀρχὸς εὖ μαθ[ὼ]ν ἄκοντι τ[
 πειρέαι; λίην λιάζεις κυρ[
 ἴσθι νυν, τάδ' ἴσθι ...γγο[

It may of course be questioned whether fr. 105 and the apparently related fr. 106 are from the same sort of battle-related poem: to me it seems likely that they are, but currently this cannot be demonstrated. At least the critical words addressed to Glaucus in fr. 96 are almost certainly²⁰ secured for a context of warfare by the phrase εἶλες αἰχμῆι at line 5, supporting the contextualization of these lines after somebody's military victory (μάχη κρατησ [...]) in Sosthenes' prose narrative:

Γλαῦκε, τίς σε θεῶν νό]ον
 καὶ φρένας τρέψ[ας
 γῆς ἐπιμνήσαιο τ[ῆσδε
 δει]νὰ τολμήσας μεθ[
 ---] ἠν εἶλες αἰχμῆι καὶ λ[

In fr. 89, finally, there was apparently, though not obvious in our surviving text, a prayer, whether by the poet or by one of his actors (and if one of these, probably Erxies); and it was a prayer which the gods answered: εὐχομένῳ οὖν [----- ἐπήκ]ουσαν οἱ θεοὶ (the line of prose following the quotation of fr. 89 printed above).

Archilochus' recurrent focus on the *polis* and the probable length of these poems – fr. 91, incomplete at its beginning and end, runs to 46 lines, and must have been substantially longer when complete – both seem to me to count against primary performance of complete

¹⁹ Not from the Parian inscriptions but from *P.Oxy.* 2314 col. i. West plausibly marks the words ἀρχὸς εὖ μαθ[ὼ]ν ἄκοντι τα[as beginning a new poem.

²⁰ I say 'almost certainly' because Archilochus uses the same phrase at fr. 23.19 in what appears to be a sexual context (Bowie, 2008, p. 139, with references to earlier discussions at n.15).

poems in the symposium, but it would be unwise to exclude the possibility entirely.²¹ And as far as re-performance goes, I could readily imagine striking sections of such a trochaic poem being delivered to a sympotic audience.

One factor that may have tempted some (including me) to propose sympotic performance is that at least *some* such tetrameter poems of Archilochus seem to have been addressed to individuals. Thus fr. 88 is almost certainly the opening line of a poem addressed to Erxies, since it is quoted as an example of the metre – and metricians characteristically quote first lines: Ἐρξίη, πῆι δηῖτ' ἄνολβος ἀθροίζεται στρατός.²² That same Erxies is addressed at fr. 89.28, in the middle of a poem – quite probably the same poem as was opened by fr. 88, and certainly, as we have seen, a poem set in the context of a war against Naxians, and in the view of Mnesiepes involving encouragement by Archilochus to his fellow-fighters.

Fr. 105 quoted above is also probably a first line, but less certainly so than fr. 88, addressed to Glaucus, the same Glaucus to whom Archilochus addressed, presumably in a symposium, the iambic trimeter erotic narrative of fr. 48; perhaps the hexameter fr. 15; whom he *perhaps* apostrophised in mid-narrative in the tetrameters of fr. 96.1 (quoted above); and to whom he certainly addressed the *gnōmē* of fr. 131.²³

The opening (if it is) of fr. 88 (Ἐρξίη, πῆι δηῖτ' ἄνολβος ἀθροίζεται στρατός;) implies the context of a gathering (ἀθροίζεται) with military purpose (στρατός), presumably set at a critical time when war was yet again (δηῖτ') imminent. The adjective indicates that the στρατός has relatively recently suffered a serious reverse.

Why are Erxies and Glaucus addressed? We might guess that Erxies and Glaucus are στρατηγοί or the like. We do not know if there was a difference between a στρατηγός and an ἄρχων in the seventh century Parian settlement on Thasos: so when in fr. 113.7-9 the poet asks somebody whom he classes as an ἄρχός a critical question, followed up by the dismissive λίαν λιάζεις, 'you shrink back too readily', the context might again be military rather than political.²⁴ In one of his criticism of leading figures he uses the term στρατηγός – the four tetrameters much quoted in the second century AD, fr. 114, on the superiority of a short but tough στρατηγός. In another, fr. 115, he uses the verb ἄρχει of the commanding position of one Leophilus, a position which he seems to find oppressive. Such critical remarks could well

²¹ On the length of sympotic performances see Bowie (2016), concluding that despite their length Solon fr. 13 (76 lines) and perhaps even his *Salamis* (100 lines, according to Plutarch) were probably first performed in a sympotic context.

²² The context of the quotation is as follows: τροχαιὸς δὲ ἐκλήθη ὅτι τρώχαλον ἔχει τὸν ῥυθμόν· καὶ γὰρ ὁ Ἀρχιλόχος ἐπὶ τῶν θερμῶν ὑποθέσεων αὐτῶι κέχρηται, ὡς ἐν τῶι Ἐρξίη, πῆι δηῖτ' ἄνολβος ἀθροίζεται στρατός (Anon. Ambros. *de re metrica* (Studemund, *Anec. var.* 223.2) cf. *Et. Gud.* / *Et. Magn.* p.376.52, Hephaest. *Ench.* 6.2 + *schol.* p. 271.6 & 21 Consbruch).

²³ This Glaucus son of Leptines (fr. 131.1) is surely the same as the man of that name and patronymic commemorated in the *agora* of archaic Thasos (Grandjean, Salviat and Blondé, 2000, p. 69, with plate 29), i.e. an historical individual.

²⁴ Fr. 114 famously criticizes a tall and elegantly turned out στρατηγός, fr. 115 uses the verb ἄρχει of the commanding position of one Leophilus which the poet seems to find oppressive.

be accommodated in an address to a στρατός, but it must be admittedly that they could equally belong to poems intended for performance in a sympotic context, as is usually thought. If some of the addressees of the Archilochean battle narratives were both identified there as archons and/or were known to the later historian Demeas as having held the archonship, it becomes much easier to understand why he believed that he could offer a chronological frame for his account of the activity of Archilochus on seventh-century Paros and Thasos, as he claimed according to *SEG* 15.518 column I 1-9:

[ἀναγέγραφε] γὰρ [Δ]ημέας οὐ μόνον περὶ Πά[ρου], ἀλλὰ καὶ
 [περὶ ὧν πέπρ]ακται ὑπὸ Ἀρχιλόχου καὶ τῆς Ἀρχιλόχ[ου περὶ πάν]
 [τας τοὺς θεοῦ]ς εὐσ<ε>βείας καὶ τῆς περὶ τὴν πατ[ρίδα σπου]-
 [δῆς· ἀνέμνησ]ε γὰρ τῶν πεπραγμένων ὑ[πὸ τοῦ ποιη]-
 [...]ς τοῦ ἀνηγογώχτος ταῦτα εἰς αὐ[τὸν τὸν Ἀρχί]-
 [λοχόν]. ἀναγέγραφεν δὲ ὁ Δημέας ἕκαστα τ[ῶν πεπραγμέ]-
 [νω]ν καὶ γεγραμμένων ὑπὸ Ἀρχιλόχου κατ' [ἄρχοντα]
 ἕκαστον καὶ ἦρκται ἀπὸ ἄρχοντος πρώτων Εὐρ [. . . , ἐφ' οἷ]
 λέγει πεντηκόντορο<v> Μιλησίων πρέσβεις ἄγ[ουσαν]

It seems, however, that in one tetrameter poem presumably focused on *polis*-issues (fr. 109.1-2) the addressee was not an elite individual but the citizenry at large.²⁵ It is the only address to πολῖται in the surviving corpus of elegiac and iambic poetry, and one of only four uses of the term πολίτης in that corpus.²⁶ The only place where such an address to citizens or groups of citizens is audible in elegiac poetry is in Solon fr. 4; and there, as I argued in 1986, despite the line ταῦτα διδάξει θυμὸς Ἀθηναίους με κελεύει (fr. 4), we seem rather to have ‘an elegy in which, probably within an expository framework where Solon did speak in his own person, one set of sentiments was encapsulated as the views of the rich addressed to the μέσοι and another as the views of the μέσοι addressed to the rich. It will have been this framework (presumably of the form “the rich could well say to the μέσοι” and “the μέσοι could well say to the rich”) that made it clear to the author of the Athenaeon Politeia what was happening. The poem as a whole from which our fragments come need have been addressed neither to the rich nor to the μέσοι, nor somehow to both groups.²⁷ By contrast, in Archilochus fr. 109 we have direct address to πολῖται:

<ᾶ> λιπερνῆτες πολῖται, τὰμὰ δὴ συνίετε
 ῥήματα ...

²⁵ Quoted by the *scholia* on Aristophanes, *Peace* 603. It is worth asking whether Aristophanes, in reworking this tetrameter in *Peace* (as it is also said by the scholiast that Cratinus did in his *Pytine*) knew it from a sequence whose other lines indicated that, like Hermes in *Peace*, Archilochus was explaining or commenting on the origins of a conflict of the Parians on Thasos with either Naxians or Thracians.

²⁶ The other three are Mimnermus fr. 7 (= *Theognidea* 795-6), Theognis 219-20 and *Theognidea* 455. There are many more uses of the term ἀστός, but none is in the vocative.

²⁷ Bowie, 1986, p. 20.

We cannot be so sure that this is the opening line of a poem as we can in the case of fr. 88. It may be have been a rhetorical reinforcement of some advice in which it was embedded, like the γνῶθί νυν, εἴ τοι[... of fr. 89.17 (printed above), i.e. something from the middle of a poem. But wherever it stood, it suggests that the sequence of which it was a part was directed to a plurality of πολῖται. It may be worth recalling that Hipponax's choliambic trimeter, fr. 1, also purports to address a public gathering: ὦ Κλαζομένοι, Βούπαλος κατέκτεινεν ... Hipponax may be posturing in a poetic mode he knows from Archilochus.

One very probable context for first performance of these long tetrameter poems, then, seems to me to be a gathering of the Parian στρατός on Thasos, called by a *strategos* or *archon* who will lead this στρατός (yet again, δηῦτε) into battle. The context is thus not dissimilar to that for the singing of Tyrtaeus' elegiac martial exhortatory songs in the Spartan royal *skene* which I tried to reconstruct in 1990, working from Philochorus *FGrH* 328 F216 and Lycurgus, in *Leocratem* 107.²⁸ That around 650 BC Archilochus might do with trochaic tetrameters on Thasos what Tyrtaeus at about the same time, followed by later generations of Spartans, chose to do with elegy should be interesting but not surprising. And it may be a corollary of the fact that, despite Peek's precarious attempt to create four lines of martial exhortatory elegy from the Sosthenes monument,²⁹ and despite many papyri and quotations, we have no certain martial exhortatory *elegy* for Archilochus.³⁰ A fragment of elegiac poetry almost certainly by Archilochus, *Adespota elegiaca* 61 W (*P.Oxy.* 2507), offers a narrative not dissimilar to those in the tetrameter fragments, but no demonstrable reflection or exhortation.³¹

There is also, however, another way of interpreting our very scanty evidence. On this alternative hypothesis the reason for the gathering of the στρατός of Parians would be the formal burial of the dead after a battle or battles. The Archilochean poems would then become some sort of ancestors of the fifth-century Attic *logos epitaphios*. The prime focus of such an address will predictably be on the achievements of the fallen warriors, but there is room in the rhetoric for encouragement to the survivors to fight even more fiercely, albeit more prudently.

In favour of this hypothesis might be seen the occasional zooming-in on the death of a warrior, e.g. fr. 89.13: ἤριπεν πλιγγῆσι, δοῦπος δ' ἀμόρωρ' ἐπὶ χθονός (for the adjacent lines see the fuller quotation above). Moreover a palmary context might thus be offered for fr. 108W:

²⁸ Bowie, 1990.

²⁹ Fr. 7: Peek, 1985, p. 14.

³⁰ Some scholars have interpreted the narrative of Telephus' defence of Mysia in the new elegiac fragment of Archilochus, *P.Oxy.* 4708, as an *exemplum* relating to a contemporary war situation; but although it begins with a *gnōmē* there is no exhortation in the surviving lines, and for the view that the poem was rather a mythological narrative see Bowie (2010).

³¹ *P. Oxy.* 2507 was tentatively ascribed to Archilochus by its editor Lobel in 1964. That ascription was shown to be correct by Henry (1998).

κλῦθ' ἀναξ Ἥφαιστε, καί μοι σύμμαχος γουνουμένοι
ἵλαος γενέο, χαρίζεο δ' οἶά περ χαρίζεαι ...

Might Archilochus here be praying to Hephaestus to grant the χάρις of fire to bodies which were about to be cremated? Admittedly Plutarch, who quotes these two lines, took the view that in these lines Archilochus was praying (εὐχόμενος) to the god himself and was not using the name Hephaestus to refer to his δύναμις, 'fire', as he did in elegiac fr. 9.10-11, which Plutarch also quotes.³² Perhaps Plutarch knew enough of the poem on either side of these lines to establish the distinction he wants, but it should be worrying that he is clearly looking around for passages which do establish that distinction. That fr. 108 is a prayer in the context of a cremation ceremony seems to me to remain a possibility: the χάρις that Hephaestus characteristically gives is fire, but it is a prayer to him as a deity that will ensure that a funeral pyre burns effectively.

It might be objected that on both Paros and Thasos in the archaic period the predominant form of burial was inhumation.³³ Until some 30 years ago that would have been a serious objection. But in the late 1980s two large collective cist-graves were discovered near the harbour of the city of Paros (Paroikia, the island's *chora*), dated to the late eighth century BC, which contained amphoras in which were found the bones of some 120 men between the ages of 18 and 45 – in one case a spear-head was embedded in a bone: these men had been cremated and their bones had been cleaned before they were deposited in the amphoras.³⁴ On current (probable reliable) chronologies this polyandrion is some two generations before Archilochus. But it shows that, after a battle in which there were substantial losses, the Parians of the archaic period might resort to mass cremation and burial of their war dead.

SOLON: FIRST PERFORMANCE OF SOLON'S TETRAMETERS

If what I have suggested for Thasos in the middle of the seventh century is correct then Solon's political tetrameters too *may* have had some similar sort of context of performance, rather than the symposium, and they might bring with them Solon's very similarly textured iambic trimeters.³⁵ It might be suggested that the story of Solon performing his elegiac, 100-line poem *Salamis* in the *agora* was a confused memory of such performances. That elegies were characteristically sung or chanted to the accompaniment of an *aulos* still seems to me now, as it did in 1986, one of several reasons to reject this tradition about the performance of the *Salamis*,³⁶ for although there were locations outside the symposium

³² Plutarch quotes fr. 108W and fr. 9.10-11W at *de poetis audiendis* 6 = *moralia* 23a-b.

³³ For Thasos cf. the graves that yielded the jewellery discussed by Sgourou and Agelarakis (2001).

³⁴ See Blackman (1996/1997), Zaphiropoulou and Agelarakis (2001), Lloyd (2018), Agelarakis (2018).

³⁵ For a wide-ranging examination of Solon's political poetry, emphasizing the importance, above all for his elegies, of sympotic performance contexts, see Irwin (2005).

³⁶ Bowie, 1986, p. 18-21.

where an *aulos* could be played – such as when an army was marching into battle, or in performances in a theatre – a public meeting called to debate policy was not one of these locations. But the absence of an *aulos* would not be a reason for denying that tetrameters might be performed at some sort of public meeting.

RE-PERFORMANCE OF SOLON AT THE *APATOURIA*?

One other context in which Plato in the *Timaeus* presents Solonian poetry as being re-performed is in competitions at the *Apatouria*:

Κριτίας. Ἐγὼ φράσω, παλαιὸν ἀκηκοῶς λόγον οὐ νέου ἀνδρός. ἦν μὲν γὰρ δὴ τότε Κριτίας, ὡς ἔφη, σχεδὸν ἐγγυς (b) ἤδη τῶν ἐνενήκοντα ἐτῶν, ἐγὼ δὲ πηι μάλιστα δεκέτης· ἡ δὲ Κουρεῶτις ἡμῖν οὐσα ἐτύγγανεν Απατουρίων. τὸ δὴ τῆς ἑορτῆς σύνηθες ἐκάστοτε καὶ τότε συνέβη τοῖς παισίν· ἄθλα γὰρ ἡμῖν οἱ πατέρες ἔθεσαν ῥαψωιδίας. πολλῶν μὲν οὖν δὴ καὶ πολλὰ ἐλέχθη ποιητῶν ποιήματα, ἅτε δὲ νέα κατ' ἐκείνον τὸν χρόνον ὄντα τὰ Σόλωνος πολλοὶ τῶν παίδων ἦισαμεν. εἶπεν οὖν τις τῶν φρατέρων, εἴτε δὴ δοκοῦν αὐτῶι τότε εἴτε καὶ χάριν τινὰ τῶι Κριτίαι φέρων, δοκεῖν οἱ τά τε (c) ἄλλα σοφώτατον γεγενῆσθαι Σόλωνα καὶ κατὰ τὴν ποίησιν αὐτῶν ποιητῶν πάντων ἔλευθεριώτατον. (Plato, *Timaeus* 21a-c)

This statement (if reliable) locates musical competitions (ἄθλα) between παῖδες on the *Koureotis* – the third day of the *Apatouria* – so called because on that ‘cutting day’ a lock or locks of epebes’ hair was cut and ritually offered before the animal sacrifice. This ceremony marked their becoming adult members of the phratry.³⁷ If this happened at a ceremony conducted by a phratry then the numbers may have been relatively small, and in that respect the occasion was not dissimilar to a symposium; but Plato has Critias call it a ἑορτή, and the competitions (ἄθλα) seem to be more formally structured than in the symposium, admittedly always inherently agonistic. There is no indication that wine is central to the rituals, or that any of the older men present gave musical performances. What the boys performed is of great interest: Plato has Critias claim that many of the boys sang poems of Solon because at that time they were ‘new’ (νέα). One striking feature of Plato’s language here is that he describes the παῖδες as singing, and their performance as ῥαψωιδία. He does not, then, imagine competitions in playing the *aulos*, far less singing while accompanied by the *aulos* (principally, that is, the singing of elegy), but a performance involving young singers playing a stringed instrument as an accompaniment to singing, more probably a lyre (suitable for symposia) than a larger and more challenging *cithara* (appropriate for professional public performances).³⁸

³⁷ The MSS of Plato *Timaeus* make the speaker Critias only ten at the imagined time, which is inconsistent with the other evidence linking the *Koureotis* with epebic age, and I suspect Plato’s text had a number in the mid-teens.

³⁸ For the difference between smaller *lyra* and the *cithara* see Power (2010).

If there is any substance at all in Plato's idea that the *παῖδες* in the sixth century sang the recently composed poems of Solon, which of the genres across which that poetry was spread is most likely to have been sung? So far as we know Solon was never credited with hexameters, so the *παῖδες* did not sing hexameters in the way rhapsodes did in competition at the *Panathenaea* once that festival had been established. That they performed elegy is possible: even though the instrument with which the performance of elegy is predominantly associated is the *aulos*, I accept that mentions of the *λύρη* accompanying singing at *Theognidea* 534 and 975 may be self-referential, and so may indicate that the *lyra*, always present in a symposium anyway, might be used to accompany elegy in the way that more often it was accompanied by an *aulos*. There remain iambic trimeters, which Aristotle famously regarded as nearest to ordinary speech, and trochaic tetrameters. Might the trochaic tetrameters of Solon, focussed on the problems of the *polis*, have been sung by *παῖδες* on the verge of becoming adult *πολιται* at the Ionian *Apatouria* in Athens, and might other poets' tetrameters have been sung at *Apatouria* in other parts of the Ionian world?

ARCHILOCHUS REVISITED

That the *Apatouria* might have been a possible context for the performance of tetrameters takes me back very briefly to Archilochus. If tetrameters were sung at the Parian or Thasian *Apatouria*, might the precocious *παῖς* Archilochus have sung not the songs of other poets but his own? And if he did, is this where we should locate fr. 117 τὸν κεροπλάστην ἄειδε Γλαῦκον, 'sing of Glaucus with the horn-fashioned lock', picking out the distinctive hair-style of his friend Glaucus son of Leptines, who on this hypothesis would already be a friend from their childhood, as well as giving us a precious indication of *sung* performance if the word ἄειδε is self-referential?

I am tempted also to return, finally, to fr. 108 (κλῦθ' ἄναξ Ἥφαιστε, καί μοι σύμμαχος γουνομένωι / ἴλαος γένοο, χαρίζο δ' οἶά περ χαρίζεαι). Hephaestus is the only god addressed in Archilochus' tetrameters (though many others are referred to), and we know from the Hellenistic scholar Ister (*FGrH* 334 F2) that Hephaestus was especially associated with the *Apatouria* at Athens:

Τρεῖς ἄγουσιν Ἀθηναῖοι ἑορτὰς λαμπάδας, Παναθηναίους, καὶ Ἥφαιστειούς, καὶ Προμηθεΐους, ὡς Πολέμων φησὶν ἐν τῷ α' περὶ τῶν ἐν τοῖς προπυλαιῖσι πινάκων. Ἴστρος δ' ἐν πρώτῃ τῶν Ἀτθίδων, εἰπὼν ὡς ἐν τῇ τῶν Ἀπατουρίων ἑορτῇ Ἀθηναίων οἱ καλλίστας στολὰς ἐνδεδυκότες, λαβόντες ἡμμένας λαμπάδας ἀπὸ τῆς ἐστίας, ὕμνοῦσι τὸν Ἥφαιστον θύοντες, ὑπόμνημα τοῦ κατανοήσαντα τὴν χρεῖαν τοῦ πυρὸς διδάξαι τοὺς ἄλλους.

Harpocration s.v. λαμπάς (= Istros, *FGrH* 334 F2)

Of course fr. 108 cannot belong *both* in a poem presented at the *Apatouria* by the young Archilochus *and* in a poem delivered at the burial of warriors by the mature soldier-poet Archilochus. But our ignorance of how tetrameters were performed in archaic Greek

polis is such that each possibility for which there is any evidence at all should be considered until it has been eliminated. The above discussion has attempted to exploit as many clues as can be detected to the performance contexts of poem in this metre: even if all these clues are found to be susceptible of different interpretations from mine, it will be a gain if scholars working in this field decide to think again about questions of tetrameter performance.

REFERENCES

- AGELARAKIS, Anagnostis P. *Parian Polyandria: The Late Geometric Funerary Legacy of Cremated Soldiers' Bones on Socio-Political Affairs and Military Organizational Preparedness in Ancient Greece*. Oxford: Archaeopress Publishing, 2018.
- BLACKMAN, David. Archaeology in Greece. *Archaeological Reports*, v. 43, p. 1-125, 1996/1997.
- BOWIE, Ewen. Early Greek elegy, symposium and public festival. *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, v. 106, p. 1-35, 1986.
- BOWIE, Ewen. Miles ludens. The problem of martial exhortation in early Greek elegy. In: MURRAY, Oswyn (Ed.). *Symptica. A symposium on the symposium*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990. p. 221-9.
- BOWIE, Ewen. Ancestors of Herodotus in Early Greek Elegiac and Iambic Poetry. In: LURAGHI, Nino (Ed.). *The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001. p. 45-66.
- BOWIE, Ewen. Sex and politics in Archilochos' poetry. In: KATSONOPOULOU, Dora; PETROPOULOS, Ioannes; KATSAROU, Stella (Ed.). *Archilochos and his age. Proceedings of the second International Conference on the Archaeology of Paros and the Cyclades, Paroikia, Paros, 7-9 October, 2005*. Athens: Ekdoseis Diktynna, 2008. p. 133-41.
- BOWIE, Ewen. Historical narrative in archaic and early classical Greek elegy. In: KONSTAN, David; RAAFLAUB, Kurt A. (Ed.). *Epic and history*. Malden MA and Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010. p. 145-66.
- BOWIE, Ewen. Quo usque tandem? How long were sympotic songs? In: CAZZATO, Vanessa; OBBINK, Dirk; PRODI, Enrico E. (Ed.). *The Cup of Song: Studies on Poetry and the Symposium*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016. p. 28-41.
- BOWIE, Ewen. The Lesson of Book 2. In: IRWIN, Elizabeth K.; HARRISON, Thomas (Ed.). *Interpreting Herodotus*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018. p. 53-74.
- BUDELMANN, Felix; POWER, Timothy. The inbetweenness of sympotic elegy. *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, v. 133, p. 1-19, 2013.
- CLAY, Diskin. *Archilochos heros: the cult of poets in the Greek polis*. Washington, DC: Center for Hellenic Studies, 2004.

- GRANDJEAN, Yves; SALVIAT, François; BLONDÉ, Francine. *Guide de Thasos*. 2nd ed. Athens; Paris: École Française d'Athènes, 2000.
- HENRY, William Ben. An Archilochus papyrus? *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, v. 121, p. 94, 1998.
- IRWIN, Elizabeth K. *Solon and early Greek poetry: the politics of exhortation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- KONDOLEON, Nikolaos M. Νέαι Ἐπιγραφαὶ περὶ τοῦ Ἀρχιλόχου ἐκ Πάρου. *Αρχ. Ἐφ.* 1952 (1954) 32-95, with plates 3-4.
- KONDOLEON, Nikolaos M. Zu den neuen Archilochosinschriften. *Philologus*, v. 100, p. 29-39, 1956.
- LLOYD, Matthew. The dead are many. A polyandron from Paros. 2018. Available from: <<https://www.ancientworldmagazine.com/articles/dead-are-many-polyandron-paros/>>.
- PEEK, Werner. Zu den neuen Archilochosinschriften. *Philologus*, v. 99, p. 4-50, 1955.
- PEEK, Werner. Ein neues Bruchstück vom Archilochos-Monument des Sosthenes. *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, v. 59, p. 13-22, 1985.
- POWER, Timothy. *The Culture of Kitharoidia*. Washington, DC: The Center for Hellenic Studies, 2010.
- SGOUROU, Marina; AGELARAKIS, Anagnostis P. Jewellery from Thasian graves. *Annual of the British School at Athens*, v. 96, p. 327-54, 2001.
- SICKING, Christiaan M. J. Review of West (1982). *Mnemosyne*, v. 39, p. 423-32, 1986.
- WEST, Martin L. *Iambi et elegi graeci*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971-1972. [2nd edition 1989, 1992]. 2 v.
- WEST, Martin L. *Greek Metre*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982.
- ZAPHIROPOULOU, Photini N. Recent finds from Paros. In: STAMATOPOULOU, Maria; YEROULANOU, Marina (Ed.). *Excavating Classical culture. Recent archaeological discoveries in Greece*. Oxford: The Beazley Archive and Archaeopress, 2002. p. 281-4.
- ZAPHIROPOULOU, Photini N.; AGELARAKIS, Anagnostis P. Warriors of Paros. Soldiers' burials offer clues to the rise of Classical Greek city-states. *Archaeology*, v. 58, p. 30-5, 2005.

