

MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS AND THE PAEAN IN ARCHILOCHUS

PAULA DA CUNHA CORRÊA

University of São Paulo

RESUMEN

El presente artículo analiza la significación de la relativamente frecuente ocurrencia de la terminología musical en los fragmentos de Arquíloco, tal como *auloí* y ejecutantes de *auloí* (fr.58.12,269), *liras* (fr.54.11, 93a lira + *aulos*), la trompeta (fr. 214) y el ejecutante de trompa (fr. 269), y la referencia al peán (fr.121) en sus contextos.

ABSTRACT

This paper intends to examine the significance of the relatively frequent occurrence of musical terminology in the fragments of Archilochus, such as *auloi* and *auloi* players (fr. 58.12, 269), lyres (fr.54.11, 93a lyre + *aulos*), the trumpet (fr. 214) and horn player (fr. 269), and reference to a paean (fr.121), in their contexts.

PALABRAS CLAVE:

Terminología musical-Peán-Arquíloco

KEY WORDS:

Musical Terminology-Paeon-Archilochus

In comparison with other archaic elegiac and iambic poets, the occurrences of musical terminology in the fragments of Archilochus are remarkable for their number and variety. Statistics may be hazardous when applied to such a faulty *corpus*, but if we first consider musical instruments and musicians, with the exception of the various occurrences in the *Theognidea*,¹ whose dating is neither uniform nor certain, in the extant elegies and

¹ ἀλιητήρ 533, 825, 943, 975, 1041, 1065, ἀλιητής 941, ἀλίσκοκ 241, ἀλόξ 532, 761, 885, κιθάρα 778, φόρμιγξ 761, 791, λύρη 534, 975.

iambi we only find a few isolated references, such as συριίζει in Hipponax 79.11,² lyres in *Margites* 1.3 and in Ion 32.1,³ and an *aulos* player in a elegiac distich (*ad. eleg.* 19.1⁴) quoted by Athenaeus 337e, while the verses of Archilochus contain *auloi* (93a) and an *aulos* player (58.12), lyres (54.11, 93a), a conch (214) and a horn player (269).⁵ Before inquiring into the nature and function of these references, let us examine them in their contexts.

54.11 *P. Oxy.* 2312 fr. 1-4 ed. Lobel:]ν λύρην π[lyre

58.12 *P. Oxy.* 2312 fr. 6+7+8 ed. Lobel: ἄιδων] ὑπ' ἀύλητῆ[ρος singing to the accompaniment of a *aulos* player⁶

54 and 58 belong to Pap. Oxy. 2312 that contains fragments pertaining (apparently) to the erotic narratives involving the daughter or daughters of Lycambes. In this case, the lyre mentioned (54.11), and the “singing to the accompaniment of an *aulos* player” (58.12) may refer to the music and instruments present at a symposium, perhaps the same context of the *aulos* and lyre in fr. 93a:

93^a: Sosthenes inscription A I.a 43-49:

ωντολα. [x] ειπρασ [x]ιων πάις Πεισιστράτου
5 ἄνδρας ..(.)ωλεῦντας αὐλὸν καὶ λύρην ἀνήγαγεν
ἐς Θάσον κυσὶ Θορέξιν δῶρ' ἔχων ἀκήρατον
χρυσόν, οἰκείῳ δὲ κέρδει ξύν' ἐποίησαν κακά -

² ἴως ἔχιθνα συριίζει. West (1974: 144) suggests that the verb might refer to the dog that “hisses” at visitors “like a viper”: “(the dog) ὅς τοῖς φίλοισιν] ὡς ἔχιθνα συριίζει.”

³ *Margites* 1.3: φίλαις ἔχων ἐν χερσίν εὐφθογγον λύρην; Ion 32.1: ἐνδεκάχορδε λύρα,...

⁴ ἀνδρὶ μὲν αὐλητῆρι θεοὶ νόον οὐκ ἐνέφυσαν,| ἀλλ' ἅμα τῷ φυσῆν χῶ νόος ἐκπέταται.

⁵ I do not count the dubious occurrences West (1971¹, 1989²) indicates in Simonides: 66.3 οὐ]κ αὐλο [*aulos*?, 59.5]αἰετο φορ[*phorminx*?, 29.3 βαρβι [*barbitos*? Andrea Rotstein noted (in personal communication) that Archilochus was credited in antiquity with various innovations relating to music, and therefore the relative abundance of musical terms in Archilochus compared to other authors is consistent with his role in the history of Greek music. Cf. Rotstein, *The Idea of Iambos*, Part IV, Chapter 8: Archilochus as a musical innovator (forthcoming).

⁶ Αὐλητῆρ does not occur in Homer, but in pseudo-Hesiod *Scutum* 283 = 298.

...] the son of Pisistratus brought back to Thasos men (?) *aulos* and lyre, bearing pure gold as a gift for Thracian dogs, and for personal profit they did public harm⁷

214: Hesychius s.v. σάλπιγξ

Ἑσιγηνοσάλπιγξ · ἀντὶ τοῦ κήρυξ. τινές δὲ ὄρνιν ποιόν. καὶ ὄργανον πολεμικόν. Καὶ

Θαλασίην σάλπιγγα

Παρ' Ἀρχιλόχῳ <ἐκδέχονται> δὲ τὸν στρόμβον. { ἐκδέχονται δέ } καὶ Σάλπιγγος Ἀθηνᾶς ἱερόν παρὰ Ἀργείοις.⁸

Ἑ *sigēnosálpinks*: instead of 'herald'. Some say it is a kind of bird, and a war instrument.

And there is the 'sea trumpet' in Archilochus; they understand it of the conch. And there is also the temple of Athena of the trumpet among the Argives.

Archilochus could be referring here to the use of conches as improvised trumpets for signaling, and these are most frequently mentioned as battle-field instruments: "Certain sea shells and animal horns require only the making of a mouth-hole to become natural trumpets, and they have been put to this use from the earliest times" (West, 1992: 121).⁹

269 Pollux 4.71: ὁ δὲ τοῖς αὐλοῖς χρώμενος αὐλητής, καὶ κεραύλης κατὰ τὸν Ἀρχίλοχον.

"One who plays *auloi* is called an aulos-player and, according to Archilochus, a 'horn blower'"

Archilochus obviously knows the word αὐλητής (*aulos*-player), perhaps present

⁷ The three and a half verses of the quotation of the poem are practically lost and the sense of the event narrated is difficult, producing various diverging interpretations. Cf. Owen (2003).

⁸ Bossi (1990: 220-22) attributes θαλασσίην to Hesychius, and argues that the accusative σάλπιγγα is due to the gloss and not a direct quotation (cf. also Gerber, 1999).

⁹ But cf. also *Thgn.* 1229-30.

in fragment 58 quoted above. This must be a joke. When he calls a musician who plays the *aulos* a “horn player”, he alludes, most probably, to this individual’s practice of *fellatio*: in fragment 247¹⁰ *keras* is a metaphor for the penis.

When one notes the number of musical instruments in the fragments of Archilochus, compared to those present in other elegiac and iambic poets (excluding the *Theognidea*), one may at first think that this, a marked feature of self-referential genres such as choral lyric, could be due to the range of genres practiced by the poet, as his references to the dithyramb and paeon might suggest. However, it seems that most of these *auloi* and lyres appear in the context of narratives, and therefore would not be self-referential.

Nonetheless, if the narrative context in fragments 54.11, 58.12, 93^a (and most probably 269) is that of a symposium, and if these very same poems were composed for symposium performance, then we do have some sort of referential function, or at least a mirroring: a symposium context being narrated in the context of a symposium. Could we then say that the symposium, as in the Theognidean *corpus*, is more present in Archilochus than in other archaic iambic and elegiac poets? The symposium may have been a favored theme, or just the most natural scenario and performative context for Archilochus’ erotic narratives.

Besides the references to musical instruments employed in narrative context or as metaphors (and in this case also non-referential), we also find in the verses of Archilochus references to poetical terminology, two general and three more specific or “technical” terms: *aoide* (253) *melos* (120), iambus (215), dithyramb (120) and paeon (121). Fragment 253 is interesting for the enchanting power of song.¹¹ Regarding 215,¹² I agree with Rotstein (2008) in general, but I might just ask: as the speaker rejects iambi in an iambic trimeter, is he being

¹⁰ Archilochus 247: Ἀριστοτέλης δέ, φασί (Arist. Pseudepigraphus p. 166 Rose) κέραι ἄγλαόν (Il. 11.385) εἶπεν ἀντὶ τοῦ αἰδοῖο σεμνυνόμενον ... καὶ ἔοικεν ὁ σκορπιώδης τὴν γλώσσαν Ἀρχίλοχος ἀπαλὸν κέρας τὸ αἰδοῖον εἰπὼν ἐντεῦθεν τὴν λέξιν πορίσασθαι.

¹¹ Archilochus 253: τὸ μέλος καὶ [.....]αὶ ταραχῶν εἶν [αὶ κ]αταπ [α]υστικόν, ὡς ἐπι[.....]των καὶ τῶν ζώ[ων].....]σθαὶ καταπραυνο[μένω]ν· διὸ καὶ τὸν Ἀρχίλο[χον] λ]έγειν

Κηλωταιδοτισ[.(.) . |]ων αἰδαῖς

Song has the power to cause...disturbances to cease, since...and animals are pacified. Therefore Archilochus says: ...is charmed by songs of... Cf. *Od.* 1.337, 11.333, 12.39.

¹² Archilochus 215: Tzetzes *All. Hom.* **W** 125 ss.

Ποιεῖ ὄπερ καὶ ὕστερον Ἀρχίλοχος ἐκεῖνος· | σφῆς ἀδελφῆς γὰρ σύζυγον πνιγέντα τῇ θαλάσῃ | περιπαθῶς ᾠδύρετο. Γράφειν μὴ θέλων ὄλωσ, | λέγων πρὸς τοὺς βιάζοντας συγγράμμασιν ἐγκύπτειν·

Καί μ' οὐτ' ἰάμβων οὔτε τερωπλέων μέλει.

ironic, or is this just more evidence for the fact that this meter, at the time, was not necessarily associated with what was understood by “iambi”? Although the dithyramb (glossed as the *melos* of lord Dionysus) in fragment 120 deserves a new appreciation, I will focus this paper on fragment 121 and the paean in Archilochus.

121: αὐτὸς ἐξάρχων πρὸς αὐλὸν Λέσβιον παιήονα

Gerber’s translation (1999): “I myself taking the lead in the Lesbian paean to the pipe’s accompaniment”

In the first place, is it a Lesbian paean sung to the *aulos*, or a paean sung to a Lesbian *aulos*? We have no references in our extant sources either to a Lesbian paean or to Lesbian *auloi*. Although Liebel (1818: 128) translates “Lesbian paean”, he is the first to raise this question. Lasserre and Bonnard (1958) are the only ones to translate the adjective with the *aulos*¹³ Lasserre (1958, p. 29) notes the absence of other testimonies for the paean being played by a Lesbian *aulos*, but refers to the chronology of Terpander in relation to Archilochus.

Other editions and commentaries since Schneidewin (1838) also mention Terpander’s chronological proximity to Archilochus,¹⁴ but to the opposite effect, in support of their reading “Lesbian” with “paean”, not with *aulos*,¹⁵ and this has been the general tendency¹⁶. Diehl (1926¹) quoted Terpander 697 *PMG*, considered to be a paean¹⁷ although the verse is quoted in the *Suda* as a prelude (προοίμιον) to Terpander’s *Orthian Nomos*, and is not listed in Käppel (1992) or Rutherford’s (2001) collection of testimonies and fragments of paeans. We might have paeans in Sappho and Alcaeus,¹⁸ and there is a clear reference to a wedding paean in Sappho 44V. Therefore, it was perhaps with Sappho and Alcaeus in mind that the

¹³ ... entonnant moi-même le péan, au son de la flûte de Lesbos ...

¹⁴ In Pseudo-Plutarch *De Mus.* 4, Terpander is older than Archilochus, but according to Phaenias of Eresos (fr. 33 Wehrli), he is younger. Cf. Gerber 1999, Test. 9.

¹⁵ Schneidewin (1838: 189): *Lesbium dicit Paeana propter Terpantrum*. Bergk (1882), Diehl (1926¹, 1936², 1952³), Treu (1959), Adrados (1990³).

¹⁶ Bergk (1882), Bahntje (1900), Diehl (1926¹, 1936², 1952³), Edmonds (1931), Treu (1959), Tarditi (1968), Campbell (1983), Adrados (1990³), Martino-Vox (1996).

¹⁷ ἀμφὶ μοι αὐτε ἀναχθ’ ἐκατηβόλον ἀδέτω < ἄ > φρήν.

¹⁸ Cf. Käppel (1992), Paean 1 & 3: Alcaeus 307V, Sappho or Alcaeus Suppl. Lyr. Gr. S 291: P.Oxy. 2878 fr. 5.

commentaries on this verse of Archilochus quote Terpander.¹⁹ But is this enough to rule out reading “Lesbian *aulos*” in Archilochus 121?

Auloi were fabricated in many shapes and sizes. Landels (1999: 41) records what he calls “a bewildering list of some other 35 types” of *auloi* besides those named according to their pitch range (*parthenikos*, *paidikos*, *kitharisterios*, *teleios*, *hyperteleios*), or origins (Phrygian, Dorian etc.).²⁰ According to Pollux 4.81, the *πυθικός αulos* was specifically associated with paeans.

Auloi are generally thought of as oriental, due to their assumed origins and most celebrated players. Since there were Phrygian, Dorian and Lydian *auloi*, why could there not have existed a specific kind of *aulos* from Lesbos mentioned by Archilochus who, as we have seen, is fond of mentioning musical instruments in his poetry, at least more than many of his peers? If it is a Lesbian paean, this is the only extant reference to this sort of paean. What does this imply? A paean sung in a particular Lesbian style, a specific paean from Lesbos, a Lesbian *nomos*? In any case, it proves that Archilochus was well traveled and knew foreign songs or that “the music of Lesbos was already well-known” (Gerber, 1970: 33).

The second piece of evidence invoked by Diehl (1926¹) and adopted by others in support of the “Lesbian paean” is a verse from the Sosthenes Inscription (A IV.46-58, *P. Oxy.* 2313 fr.3a vv.12-21, Archilochus fr. 98.11):

98.11 — ∪ — ἄν]δ[ρ]ες αὐτοὶ Λεσβίω [...]εἰ

The context is certainly that of a battle narrative, but if this verse refers to men from Lesbos, as West (1985: 12) conjectured, on what side would they be on, or what would they be doing in Thasos, supposing this is where the battle took place?²¹ We do not hear of rivalries between Parians or Thasians and Lesbians in this period, although Marcaccini (2001: 197) suggests that Lesbians might have also come to Thasos as settlers (ἐπίοικοι) and fought either against or beside Parians as their allies.

¹⁹ Cf. Treu (1959: 223): “Von der Überlegenheit lesbischer Aoiden spricht Sappho fr. 116D., viell. im Hinblick auf ihren (älteren) Landsmann Terpandros.” See also Martino and Vox (1996: 632), who quote the same verse (Sappho 106V) with reference to the “Lesbian paean” in Archilochus 121.

²⁰ Cf. West (1992: 88) for descriptions of the specific types of *auloi*.

²¹ Cf. Marcaccini (2001: 197).

In his commentary on the Sosthenes inscription, Hiller (1900: 21) quoted fragment 121 that contains the only other reference to something “Lesbian” in Archilochus. Later, Diehl (1936²) provided the supplement “Lesbian paean” (Λεσβίω [ν παῖήονα]), adopted by Hiller, Peek, Treu²² and Lasserre,²³ and from which one infers the “Lesbian paean” would be a battle-paean.

Lasserre and Bonnard (1958: 29), with “Archilochus the soldier” in mind, suggested that fragment 121 could indicate that the paean, at the poet’s time, was sung by troops before an attack²⁴ or after victory. West (1974: 128) and Slings (1986: 3) argue that in verse 11 of fragment 98 a paean would be “premature”. But the context, as far as one can tell (and one can’t tell much), does not seem to exclude a pre-battle paean.²⁵ Besides, the practice of battle paeans varied among the Greeks, in space and time. That Dorian and Athenian battle-paeans were executed at different moments is attested by Thucydides’ (7.44.6) story of the Sicilian invasion.²⁶

Let us return to fragment 121. What kind of paean could this be? The contexts of paean performance in antiquity were varied and the genre, for us, is one of the most elusive.²⁷ Those who read “Lesbian paean” in Archilochus 121 and associated it with fragment 98.11 would have found support for their hypothesis in Ian Rutherford’s book on *Pindar’s Paeans*. For Rutherford (2001: 14) the paean “started as a song-dance” “in honor of the diety Paian/

²² (*die Männer*) selber einen Lesbischen (Paian?)

²³ ε[

α]ῦτοῖ Λεσβίω[ν Hiller (1900). [μ]ε[ν α] Hiller (1903); [ὔμνον α]ῦτοῖ Λεσβίω[ν τὸτ’ ἀμφι] Diehl (1923). ε[.] αῦτοῖ Λεσβίω[Maas (ap. Hiller 1934). Λεσβίω [ν παῖήονα] Diehl (1936, 1952); Hiller (1939). [εὐ μαθόντες ἄν]δρε[ς] αῦτοῖ Λεσβίω[ν παῖήονα] Peek (1956: 193); ἄν]δρε[ς] αῦτοῖ Λεσβίω[ν παῖήονα] Peek (1956: 4). ὕστ[ερον δ’ ἄγον]τες αῦτοῖ Λεσβίω[ν παῖή]ο[ν] [α Lass. ε[.] αῦτοῖ Λεσβίω[ν Treu; Tard., Adrados; Λεσβίω [West (1971). ἄν]δ [ο]ε[ς] αῦτοῖ Λεσβίω[ν κλ]ει[νὸν μέλος Peek (1985: 22).

²⁴ Lasserre (loc. cit.) refers to the paean before the battle of Salamis in Aeschylus *Pers.* 393.

²⁵ Cf. Rutherford (2001: 43) on the battle-παῖάν : secondary sources “imply that this could happen at various points in an attack (...) immediately before engagement; at a slightly earlier point before sacrifices had been made or omens taken; or again at the start of a campaign”

²⁶ Rutherford (2001: 44): “the Athenians in Sicily were confused when their Dorian allies sang the *paian* before battle”.

²⁷ Cf. Ford (2006: 278: “among all archaic genres, paeans have proven the most resistant to definition and categorization”), Käppel (1992) and Rutherford (2001: 7) for paeans performed in various cults, sacrifices, as apotropaic prayers, before battles and after victories, at assemblies, as a hymn of praise, at weddings, symposiums, and to honour the dead. Rutherford (2001: 52): “The παῖάν was a more flexible medium of expression than might be suggested by a systematic classification of its performance scenarios”.

Paiawon”, and since the battle is an early context for paeans, and the “*paia/n* sung before battle was sometimes linked with a ritual cry in honour of Eualios”, Rutherford believes “it may be more than a coincidence that Paian/*Paiawon* and Eualios are linked in a Linear B tablet from Knossos (KN v 52)”.²⁸

This hypothesis of the paean’s origins and the assumed “conjunction” of *Paiawon* and Eualios would fit like a glove for those who read Archilochus’ paean in fragment 121 as a battle-paean and suppose that the poet speaks of his own abilities, since it is generally held that in fragment 1 the poet professes his service to Eualios and the Muses.²⁹

Therefore, a battle-paean by Archilochus, in tribute of Eualios, would have supported Rutherford’s argument. Curiously, however, Rutherford says that Archilochus 121 might be self-referential, but he does not identify context, nor function.³⁰ We will return to this point. First, however, it has been noted by Käppel (2002) that the names *Paiawon* and Eualios are not “linked” but *juxtaposed* on the tablet, and it is methodologically improper to infer that the gods were identified. That the paean had an early role in battle is unquestioned, but to associate it with Eualios on these grounds is unjustified.

Some, as Käppel (1992), have followed Harvey (1955: 172) when he wrote without explaining that “Archilochus (76 D) and Alcman (71 D) prove the antiquity of the banquet-paean”.³¹ Strabo (10.4.18)³² leaves no doubt concerning the context of Alcman’s paean, but as for Archilochus 121, Gerber (1970: 33) “see(s) no evidence for Harvey’s statement”. On what basis could Harvey have reached this conclusion? I believe this classification comes from a misreading of the fragment’s quotation in Athenaeus, and perhaps from a conjecture

²⁸ Rutherford (2001, p. 14) quotes (KN v 52): *a-ta-na-po-ti-ni-ja* | *u[]* ...[
e-nu-wa-ri-jo | *pa-ja-wo-ne* | *po-se-da[-o-ne*

“Some late sources suggest that the pre-battle paean was dedicated to Ares or Eualios as well, but there is no classical evidence for this” (Rutherford, 2001: 43).

²⁹ In this case, one could even imagine that the service to Eualios and gifts of the Muses in fragment 1 do not represent opposed spheres of activities: the poet would serve Eualios with the gifts from the Muses, offering him a paean, if “paeans were designed to open a dialogue-relation with the god” (cf. Käppel, 1992: 13).

³⁰ Rutherford (2001: 459): “The song may refer to itself as a paean”.

³¹ Käppel (1992, Test 67, p. 317). Martino-Vox (1996: 632) quote Alcman’s sympotic paean in their commentary on Archilochus 121.

³² Strabo (10.4.18): τὰ δὲ συσσίτια ἀνδρεία παρὰ μὲν τοῖς Κρησὶν καὶ νῦν ἔτι καλεῖσθαι, παρὰ δὲ τοῖς Σπαρτιάταις μὴ διαμείναι καλούμενα ὁμοίως πρότερον· παρ’ Ἀλκμᾶνι γοῦν οὕτω κείσθαι “ θοίνας δὲ καὶ ἐν θιάσοισιν ἀνδρείων παρὰ δαιτυμόνεσσι πρόπει παιάνα κατάρχειν. Rutherford (2001: 52) believes Alcman’s verses to be self-referential, the beginning of a banquet paean.

made by Meineke and the context of Archilochus 120.

According to Bergk (1882⁴), Meineke suggested uniting the tetrameters of 121 and 120 in a single fragment. Although all editors following Bergk print the verses as distinct fragments, they do place them one after the other, either as proposed by Meineke,³³ or in the inverted order as do West (1971¹, 1989²) and Gerber (1999).³⁴

This has also forced the identification of αὐτὸς ἐξάρχων in fragment 121 with the first person (“I”) and the poet, while the nominative could have referred to a declaration or action of some third person in a narrative.³⁵ Since the context in Athenaeus’ quotation of 120 is explicitly that of a symposium, if one reads 120 and 121 together or one after the other, the same context is easily suggested, especially because the quotation of Philochorus *FGrHist* 328 F 172 in Athenaeus 14.628a, exemplified by Archilochus 120, is perhaps the earliest source for the distinction made between the turbulent performance of the dithyramb of Dionysus and the tranquil orderliness of the song for Apollo.³⁶

120: Athenaeus 628a: Φιλόχορος δέ (328 F 172) φησιν ὡς οἱ παλαιοὶ {σπένδοντες} οὐκ αἰεὶ διθυραμβοῦσιν, ἀλλ’ ὅταν σπένδωσιν, τὸν μὲν Διόνυσον ἐν οἴνῳ καὶ μέθῃ, τὸν δ’ Ἀπόλλωνα μεθ’ ἡσυχίας καὶ τάξεως μέλποντες. Ἀρχίλοχος γοῦν φησὶν·

ὡς Διωνύσοι’ ἀνακτος καλὸν ἐξαρξαι μέλος

οἶδα διθύραμβον οἴνῳ συγκεραυνωθεὶς φρένας.

“And Philochorus says that when the ancients pour libations they do not always sing the dithyrambs, but whenever they pour libations, they do so, singing of Dionysus amid wine and drunkenness, Apollo quietly and with good order. Archilochus at any rate says: for I know how to lead the dithyramb, the lovely song of lord Dionysus, my wits thunderstruck with wine”.

³³ Schneidewin (1838), Bergk (1882), Diehl (1923, 1936, 1952), Edmonds (1931), Treu (1959), Tarditi (1968), Adrados (1990³). Käppel (1992, Test. 67) refers to Archilochus 120 when he classifies 121 as a sympotic paean.

³⁴ Lasserre (1968), an exception, places the fragments apart, and West (1971¹, 1989²) suggests uniting 120 with 118 and 119.

³⁵ Grandolini (2001: 132): « anche se la sua brevità non consente di stabilire se il poeta parli di se stesso o di una terza persona o riferisca le parole di qualcun altro ».

³⁶ Cf. also Dion. Thrax 451.12-13 Hilgard and Plutarch *DE E apud Delphos* 389a-b for this polar opposition between the paean and dithyramb

The commentaries also tend to associate fragments 120 and 121 as testimonies of the poet's ability in both genres, as Hauvette says (1905: 83): “the poet boasts his ability to lead the dithyramb and the paean”,³⁷ and Campbell (1983: 255), assuming a first-person autobiographical declaration, says that Archilochus claims to lead the chorus twice: in the Lesbian paean and the dithyramb to Dionysus.

If we return to the context of Archilochus 121 in Athenaeus 5.180d-e, the verses are brought in as an example of the proper function of the *exarkhon*: it is the *phorminx* that must take the lead:

121: Athenaeus *Deipn.* 180d: οὐ γὰρ ἐξάρχοντες οἱ κυβιστηρήρες (*Il.* 18.606 = *Od.* 4.19), ἀλλ' ἐάρχοντος τοῦ ᾠδοῦ πάντες ὠρχοῦντο. Τὸ γὰρ ἐξάρχειν τῆω φόρμιγγος ἴδιον. διόπερ ὁ μὲν Ἡσίοδος φησιν ἐν τῇ Ἀσπίδι (205) “θεαὶ δ' ἐξῆρχον ἀοιδῆς Μοῦσαι Πιερίδες”, καὶ ὁ Ἀρχίλοχος ·

Athenaeus (*Deipn.* 180d): “For it was not the tumblers who took the lead, but they all danced while the singer led, since taking the lead is the lyre's proper function. That is why Hesiod says in the *Shield* (205): ‘and the divine Muses of Pieria were taking the lead in the song’, and Archilochus (121)”.

To make sense of the quotation of Archilochus 121 in this context, we could imagine that the *exarkhon* plays a lyre (*kithara* or *phorminx*) to the accompaniment of the *aulos*,³⁸ since we do have notice of the use of both instruments in paeans.³⁹ In the example brought in before Archilochus, the Muses take the lead (ἐξῆρχον), accompanied by Apollo with his golden *phorminx* (*Shield* 205):

³⁷ Hauvette (1905: 246): “Quant à son orgueil de poète, de chantre inspiré des Muses, voyez comme il rappelle, dans deux vers trocaïques, son adresse à entonner le péan et le dithyrambe ».

³⁸ Ford (2006: 285). Cf. Grandolini (2001: 132): “ἐξάρχειν followed by πρὸς + accusative means ‘to start the song to the sound of’”, as in Pindar *Ol.* 10.84 and Euripides *Al.* 346ss. According to Rutherford (2001: 66), the “soloist's part of the performance may be what is referred to by the verb first in Archilochus”.

³⁹ Although the most common instrument in paeans is the *aulos*, Polycrates (*FGrH* 588F) registers the use of *aulos* + *kithara*, and Porphyry (*Vit. Pyth.* 32) has Pythagoras singing paeans to the lyre (cf. Rutherford, 2001: 80).

ἐν δ' ἦν ἀθανάτων ἱερός χορός· ἐν δ' ἄρα μέσσω
ἴμερόεν κιθάριζε Διὸς καὶ Λητοῦς υἱὸς
χρυσείῃ φόρμιγγι· θεῶν δ' ἕδος ἀγνὸς Ὀλυμπος·
ἐν ἀγορῇ, περὶ δ' ὄλβος ἀπείριτος ἔστεφάνωτο
205 ἀθανάτων ἐν ἀγωνί· θεαὶ δ' ἐξήρχον αἰοιδῆς
Μοῦσαι Πιερίδες, λιγὺ μέλπομένης εἰκυῖαι.

“Upon it was the holy chorus of the immortals; and in the middle the son of Zeus and Leto was playing music, rousing desire, upon a golden lyre. The seat of the gods was hallowed Olympus; upon it was the assembly, and around it measureless wealth was placed in the contest of the immortals. Goddesses were beginning the song, the Pierian Muses, and they looked as though they were singing piercingly”.⁴⁰

It is true that in the larger context Athenaeus describes a symposium, but neither the verse from the *Shield* nor that of Archilochus, both quoted in a digression on the *exarkhon*'s function, refer necessarily to a symposium performance, nor do the subsequent quotations of Stesichorus 250 Davies and Pindar *P.* 1.4.

In sum, Archilochus 121 may or may not have been self-referential (although, for metrical reasons, I am inclined to believe it was not self-referential), the context of the paeon referred to could be any of those proper for paeon performance, the *exarkhon* could be the lyric-I or another third person who leads a Lesbian paeon or a paeon to the sound of a Lesbian *aulos*. If nothing may be ascertained from the context in Athenaeus, nor from the supplements of fragment 98, it is however true that the first-person speaker in Archilochus is fond of boasting poetical skills, knowledge or abilities (“I am versed in the Muse’s gift” 1, “I know how to lead the dithyramb” 120, “I know a big thing” 126), and perhaps the most appropriate context for such *bravata* or self-introductions, and the meters these are formulated in, is the symposium. However, even if we suppose fragment 121 presents a prideful lyric I in a symposium (without excluding the possibility of a speech within a narrative), he could be boasting his expertise in leading other sorts of paeans, such as those performed in

⁴⁰ Text and translation by Most (2007). Cf. Grandolini (2001: 132-133) on the passage. Is it a musical contest?

war,⁴¹ or at the most important occasions of paeon performance, the Apollonian festivals at sanctuaries, perhaps at Despotikó.⁴²

REFERENCES

- ADRADOS, F. R. (1990³) *Líricos Griegos I: Elegiacos y Yambógrafos Arcaicos*. Barcelona.
- BAHNTJE, U. (1900) *Quaestiones Archilocheae*. Göttingen.
- BERGK, T. (1882⁴, 1915) *Poetae Lyrici Graeci*. vol II. Leipzig.
- BOSSI, F. (1990) *Studi su Archiloco*. Bari.
- CAMPBELL, D. A. (1983) *The Golden Lyre, The Themes of the Greek Lyric Poets*. London.
- DIEHL, E. (1926¹, 1936², 1952³) *Anthologia Lyrica Graeca*. Leipzig.
- EDMONDS, J. M. (1931) *Greek Elegy and Iambus*. London.
- FORD, A. (2006) “The Genre of Genres. Paeans and *Paian* in Early Greek Poetry”, *Poetica* 38.3-4: 277-295.
- GERBER, D. E. (1970) *Euterpe: An Anthology of Early Greek Lyric, Elegiac and Iambic Poetry*. Amsterdam.
- _____ (1999) *Greek Iambic Poetry from the seventh to the fifth centuries B. C.* Cambridge, Mass..
- GRANDOLINI, S. (2001) “Archiloco poeta lirico”, in Maria Cannatà Fera-G. & B. D’Alessio, *I lirici greci. Forme della comunicazione e storia del testo*. «Atti dell’Incontro di Studi – Messina, 5-6 novembre 1999», Messina, 117-133.
- HARVEY, A. E. (1955) “The Classification of Greek Lyric Poetry”, *CQ*, N.S. 5, vol. 3-4: 157-175.
- HAUVETTE, A. (1905) *Archiloque, sa vie et ses poésies*. Paris.

⁴¹ Rutherford (2001: 43) on the performance of pre-battle paeans: “usually antiphonal with a leader (perhaps a general) starting the performance (the verb is and the army answering with a”. The military contexts of paeans are varied: before battles, at the moment after battle, on returning to camp, at a feast after victory or still on a ship in case of a sea-battle (Rutherford, 2001: 45).

⁴² Rutherford (2001: 8: “most of the surviving-songs were performed in the context of cult”) and Käppel (2002: 4). For the importance of the sanctuary of Apollo at Despotikó, an islet between Antiparos and Siphnos, cf. Kouragios (2008).

- HILLER v. GAERTRINGEN, F. (1900) „Archilochosinschrift aus Paros”, *AM* 25: 1-22.
_____ (1939) *Inscriptiones Graecae (XII.5.445) Supplementum*. Berlin.
- KÄPPEL, L (1992) *Paian. Studien zur Geschichte einer Gattung*. Berlin, New York.
_____ (2002) Ian Rutherford, *Pindar's Paeans. A Reading of the Fragments with a Survey of the Genre*. Oxford, 2001. *Bryn Mawr Classical Review* 10.38.
- KOURAGIOS, G. (2008) “Δεσποτικό τὸ νησὶ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνα”. In *Archilochos and his Age*. (Org.) Kaatsonopoulou, D., Petropoulos, I. & S. Katsarou. The Paros and Cyclades Institute of Archaeology, Paros II: Athens.
- LANDELS, J. G (2000²) *Music in Ancient Greece and Rome*. London.
- LASSERRE, F. (1950) *Les Épodes d'Archiloque*. Paris.
- LASSERRE, F. & A. BONNARD (1958) *Archiloque: Fragments*. Paris.
- LIEBEL, I. (1812, 1818²) *Archilochi Reliquiae*. Leipzig.
- MARCACCINI, C. *Costruire n'identità, scrivere la storia : Archiloco, Paro e la colonizzazione di Taso*. Firenze: 2001.
- MARTINO, F. & O. VOX (1996) *Lirica Greca, tomo II*. Bari.
- MOST, G. W. (2007) *Hesiod. The Shield, Catalogue of Women, Other Fragments*. Loeb, Cambridge Mass., London.
- OWEN, S. (2003) “Of dogs and men: Archilochus, archaeology and the Greek settlement of Thasos”, *PCPhS* 49: 1-18.
- PEEK, W. (1956) “Die Archilochos-Gedichte von Oxyrhynchos II”, *Philologus* 100 : 1-28.
_____ (1985) Ein neues Bruchstück vom Archilochos-Monument des Sosthenes. *ZPE* 59: 13-22.
- ROTSTEIN, A. (2008) “I do not care about *iamboi*”, in Katsonopoulou, D., Petropoulos I. & S. Katsarou, *Paros II: Archilochus and His Age*. Proceedings of the second international conference on the archaeology of Paros and the Cyclades. Paroika, Paros, 7-9 October 2005, pp. 65-79.
_____ *The Idea of Iambos*. Oxford. (forthcoming).
- RUTHERFORD, I. (2001) *Pindar's Paeans. A Reading of the Fragments with a Survey of the Genre*. Oxford.
- SCHNEIDEWIN, F. G. (1838) *Delectus Poesis Graecorum Elegiacae, Iambicae, Melicae*. Göttingen.

- SLINGS, S. R. (1986) "Archilochus: New Fragments from the Sosthenes Inscription", *ZPE* 63:1-3.
- TARDITI, G. (1968) *Archiloco*. Roma.
- TREU, M. (1959) *Archilochos*. München.
- WEST, M. L. (1971¹, 1989²) *Iambi et Elegi Graeci ante Alexandrum Cantati I*. Oxford.
- _____ (1974) *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus*. Berlin.
- _____ (1992) *Ancient Greek Music*. Oxford.