

WHERE WAS IAMBIC POETRY PERFORMED? SOME EVIDENCE FROM THE FOURTH CENTURY B.C.*

Aristotle's *Politics* 1336b20–2 (cited below) proves that in the fourth century B.C. there was more than one type of occasion for the presentation of iambic poetry. No surviving ancient testimony describes directly the circumstances of performance of literary iambus in the archaic period. Heraclitus' text¹ which comes from the turn of the sixth and fifth centuries B.C. suggests that Archilochus' poems,² like Homer's, were presented during poetic competitions, but it does not follow that Heraclitus had in mind iambic compositions of the Parian poet.³

Although our sources concern only the performance practice of iambic poetry from the fourth century B.C. onwards,⁴ it seems reasonable to assume that they reflect in some way earlier archaic practice, since the occasion of poems' performance was in Greek society an element which remained relatively stable, and which was of great importance for the identification of a poem as belonging to a particular genre.⁵ It is enough to recall that many generic names in archaic lyric, e.g. *προσόδιον*, *ἐπιθαλάμιον*, *ἐπικήδειον*, *δαφνηφορικόν* reflect the performance of poems (places, circumstances, occasions). This fact proves how important this element of context was in characterizing particular poetic genres, and in marking a poem as belonging to a particular category. We may reasonably suppose that the occasion of performance changed relatively rarely at the first stage of a literary genre's development. Frequent changes would result in varying degrees of mismatch between topic and circumstances of presentation, and, consequently, in a disappearance of the link between the content and the context which so often contributed much to the characterization of a genre at a time when oral transmission of poetic production predominated.

* I wish to thank Professor Jerzy Danielewicz (Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań) for discussing with me many 'iambic' questions from which this article much benefited. I am also grateful to Mr Ewen L. Bowie (Corpus Christi College, Oxford) for reading an earlier draft of this paper and offering valuable substantive comments and stylistic criticism. They are, of course, not responsible for the views put forward.

¹ *Τὸν τε Ὅμηρον ἔφασκεν ἄξιον ἐκ τῶν ἀγώνων ἐκβάλλεσθαι καὶ ραπίζεσθαι καὶ Ἀρχίλοχον ὁμοίως* (12 B 42 DK).

² Heraclitus used only the name of the poet, but means, of course, poems composed by him.

³ Perhaps Heraclitus had in mind those of Archilochus' pieces which deal with epic subjects. This seems to be indicated by his linking of Archilochus' compositions with Homer's. See Will's remarks on the reasons for Heraclitus' criticism of both poets, F. Will, *Archilochus* (New York, 1969), p. 65. His opinion is that the censure 'is prompted by hatred of myth, by a metaphysician's impatience with narrative means of explaining what is the quarrel between mythos and logos'. It is now difficult to say in which metre Archilochus' poems dealing with epic myths were composed. About this part of the Parian's literary output only fragmentary information can be found in later authors' works, see fr. 286–9 W. and J. A. Notopoulos, 'Archilochus The Aoidos', *TAPA* 97 (1966), 311–15, who argues that Archilochus' poems connected with mythological stories were purely epic poems in hexameters.

⁴ Aristophanes, *Frogs* 370ff., composed earlier than texts analysed here, is also relevant to the problem of the presentation of iambi, but demands a fuller study which will appear elsewhere.

⁵ For this problem see K. J. Dover, 'The Poetry of Archilochus', *Entretiens sur l'Antiquité Classique*, 10 (1963), 183ff.

A generic characteristic which seems to be more susceptible of change is the function of a poem: this could have changed even if the circumstances of a poem's presentation remained the same. Changes of function are of fundamental importance and are decisive for the direction of a genre's evolution. In the case of iambic poetry the change of function will have started when iambus became an artistic production and ceased to be used only as an integral part of cult.⁶ Its function shifted from the apotropaic-purificatory to that of entertainment, although one cannot exclude the possibility that literary iambus retained some functional elements (as well as elements of context) from its earlier ritual forms.⁷ Although the change of function of certain groups of poems should be treated as an important factor in the development of a genre, this does not mean that such a change always resulted in a change of manner or circumstances of the poems' presentation. Accordingly the ritual form of iambus, about which we have some ancient evidence, may be for us today a valuable source of information about the social context of this kind of poetry.

But let us come back to Aristotle's testimony. In the *Politics* he says: τοὺς δὲ νεωτέρους οὐτ' ἱάμβων οὔτε κωμῳδίας θεατὰς νομοθετητέον πρὶν ἢ τὴν ἡλικίαν λάβωσιν ἐν ᾗ καὶ κατακλίσεως ὑπάρξει κοινωνεῖν ἤδη καὶ μέθης.⁸ Aristotle says that young men should not be permitted to watch iambic performances until they are old enough to participate in sympotic gatherings. This implies that there was an occasion for watching such performances other than symposia and may suggest that the symposium itself offered an opportunity for becoming familiar with iambic poetry.⁹ The prohibition would have been pointless if a symposium was the only occasion when iambic poems might have been presented: if it was, young men would not be

⁶ Modern scholars' opinions about the extent to which literary iambus was independent of its ritual form differ. See, e.g. C. Carey, 'Archilochus and Lycambes', *CQ* 36 (1986), 65: 'I do not doubt that archaic iambos had its origin in the aischrologia of fertility ritual. This origin had a vital role in shaping the properties of the genre (...). But already for Archilochus iambos had broken free of its connections with ritual to become an independent poetic genre' and M. L. West, *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus* (Berlin-New York, 1974), p. 27, concluding that individuals who figured in iambi were 'not living contemporaries of Archilochus but stock characters in a traditional entertainment with some (...) ritual basis'—which may imply a connection between literary and ritual iambus stronger than Carey is inclined to accept.

⁷ For the coexistence of both religious and laic elements of social occasions, when lyric poetry was performed, especially of symposia, see F. R. Adrados, *Festival, Comedy, Tragedy. The Greek Origins of Theatre*, transl. by C. Holme (Leiden, 1975), p. 279: 'the symposium—a derivative of common meal in the festival. It possesses the quality of a closed society with agonal and sporting elements, as well as religious elements of the type offering libation and purification by means of obscenity and satire' and C. Calame, 'Morfologia e funzione della festa nell'antichità', *A.I.O.N.* 4–5 (1982–3), 9–10: 'Nell'antichità non esiste (...) una festa chi si possa, a rigore di termini, definire profana. Varia soltanto il rilievo attribuito alla partecipazione della divinità, che può essere al centro della manifestazione (...) come Dioniso che regna sul banchetto e sul baccanale che gli fa seguito. Ma in entrambi i casi, la scelta del dio convocato alla festa è determinata dal campo d'azione che gli è proprio, sicché gli attribuiti del dio che presiede alla festa conferiscono alla cerimonia uno dei suoi valori semantici essenziali.'

⁸ Aristotle's text is quoted from A. Dreizehnter's edition *Aristoteles' Politik* (Munich, 1970).

⁹ Iambic performances at symposia are also suggested by an earlier source, *Adesp. el.* fr. 27 W. = fr. 12 G.-P. but it is not certain whether συμποτικά σκώμματα the purpose of which is γέλωτα φέρειν (line 6) are to be identified with literary iambi. It is highly probable, but it must be remembered that jokes, invective and blame were also present within other genres presented at symposia, cf. B. Gentili, *Poetry and Its Public in Ancient Greece*, transl. by A. T. Cole (Baltimore-London, 1988), pp. 107–9 and G. Nagy, 'Iambos. Typologies of Invective and Praise', *Arethusa* 9 (1976), 194: 'Praise and invective as a fundamental principle in the archaic community.' For the presence of aischrology and obscenity during sympotic presentations see also E. Pellizer, 'Della zuffa simpotica' in M. Vetta, *Poesia e simposio* (Bari, 1983), p. 32.

able to become *θεαταὶ ἰάμβων* before participating in symposia. Aristotle's text, however, does not tell us what this occasion was.

Clearchus¹⁰ and Lysanias¹¹ (both quoted by Athenaeus 14.620c), the first of whom lived one,¹² the second at least two¹³ generations after Aristotle, describe the performance of Archilochus' and Semonides' poems by a rhapsode, and the purpose of these rhapsodic presentations was clearly entertainment. Clearchus specifies the theatre. There are, however, at least two objections in the case of this author's text. He uses the expression *τὰ Ἀρχιλόχου* which might refer to any sort of Archilochean poetry (elegiac, iambic or even epic),¹⁴ not necessarily iambic.¹⁵ Moreover, the word *θέατρον* used by Clearchus with reference to the place of iambic performances in the fourth century B.C. cannot be literally related to archaic performance practice. The fact that in this period *θέατρα* resembling later classical theatres (in respect of their architecture and places they were situated) did not yet exist, does not, however, by any means imply that there were no formal presentations of poetry by rhapsodes which might have gathered a considerable audience.¹⁶

But what form did the presentation of iambic poetry during public gatherings take? The answer to this question remains unsatisfactory and controversial. According to West it is highly probable that the archaic presentation of iambi comprised some elements which were characteristic of performances of comedy.¹⁷ Moreover, he puts forward the theory that iambic poetry, or at least some of the poems belonging to this genre, might have included story elements¹⁸ presented to the public not always as

¹⁰ Κλέαρχος (...) τὰ Ἀρχιλόχου, φησί, [ὁ] Σιμωνίδης ὁ Ζακύνθιος ἐν τοῖς θεάτροις ἐπὶ δόφρου καθήμενος ἔρραψώδει (= fr. 92 Wehrli).

¹¹ Λυσανίας (...) Μνασίωνα τὸν ῥαψωδὸν λέγει ἐν ταῖς δείξεσι τῶν Σιμωνίδου τινὰς ἰάμβων ὑποκρίνεσθαι.

¹² See O. Stein, 'Klearchos von Soloi', *Philologus* N.S. 40 (1931), 258–9 who established Clearchus' *floruit* between 300 and 250 B.C.

¹³ See the mention in Suda, s.v. Ἐρατοσθένης that Lysanias was the teacher of Eratosthenes. Cf. Gudeman, *RE* XIII, c. 2508. R. Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship. From the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age* (Oxford, 1968), p. 146 n. 1 who is cautious about this identification.

¹⁴ See n. 3.

¹⁵ F. Wehrli, *Die Schule des Aristoteles*, Heft III: *Klearchos* (Basel–Stuttgart, 1969), pp. 77–8 suggests that Clearchus' mention of the rhapsodic recitation of Archilochus' poems in the treatise *Περὶ γρίφων* might have referred to Archilochus' 'griphosartige Gedichte' like, e.g. fr. 81 D. (185 W.). He adds, however, that 'Ausserdem ist aber fuer Klearchos wie es scheint der rhapsodische Vortrag selbst als blosser Leistung eine Art Griphos (...), aehnlich der Darbietung von Kitharisten und Mimen'.

¹⁶ For pre-Platonic evidence dealing with places and occasions of rhapsodic performances see J. Herington, *Poetry into Drama. Early Tragedy and the Greek Poetic Tradition* (Berkeley–Los Angeles–London, 1985). Cf. also the evidence from vase painting, Beazley, *ARV*², p. 183, no. 15 where an artist is seen standing on a platform, which might suggest a formal poetic recital in front of a large number of people (cf. Herington, *Poetry*, p. 14).

¹⁷ M. L. West, 'Melos, Iambos, Elegie und Epigramm', in *Neues Handbuch der Literaturwissenschaft. Griechische Literatur*, herausgegeben von E. Vogt (Wiesbaden, 1981), pp. 86–7: 'Es ist moeglich, dass es bei den ionischen Festen, bei denen Iamboi vorgetragen wurden, auch Tanz und groteske Choere gab' and idem, *Studies*, p. 29: 'we must envisage the speaker of the iambus as dressed for a character part and as doing a little acting too', and p. 30 on fr. 78 of Hipponax: 'a narrator who is wearing an artificial phallus, like the actors of later comedy. This would also go very well with Archilochus, fr. 66–7.'

¹⁸ Although West, *Studies*, p. 35 admits that 'according to Aristotle the story element came from Sicilian comedy and was introduced by Crates' he suggests, *ibid.*, p. 36 that 'Aristotle seems to think that there was already dialogue before Crates' and that 'he (i.e. Aristotle) must have in mind something "iambic" in his sense, exchanges of a comic and ribald sort'. West concludes, *ibid.*, p. 36: 'This is pretty much what one finds in an Aristophanic play if one disregards the plot (...), and it is a plausible picture for the early fifth century. There is no proof that it does not antedate Aeschylus' introduction of the second actor in tragedy.'

narratives reported by a narrator¹⁹ but also sometimes through dialogues acted by actors. The essence of literary iambus might have been, as West suggests,²⁰ that which later was typical of comedy: mainly performances by choruses, consisting first of all of satyrs or animals, but with the presence of comic figures, who scoffed at important individuals who were well known in their society. In short, iambi might have been presented as dramatic stage performances.

West's point of view has been accepted by other scholars. They make use of both iconographic²¹ and literary sources to support this theory. In Lasserre's opinion²² the most important evidence in favour of dramatic presentation of iambi is in Aristotle's *Poetics* (1449a24–8²³ and 1459b34–7).²⁴ Adrados points out²⁵ that Greek iambi, like archaic Greek poetry in general, include dialogues. This, he thinks, suggests the dramatic presentation of these poems. It seems, however, that neither Lasserre's argument nor Adrados' observations supply proof of dramatic presentation of iambic poetry. The passage from Aristotle's work quoted by Lasserre uses the metrical term *ἱαμβεῖον*, not the generic term *ἱαμβος*, and it is obvious that these are not identical.²⁶

As to the presence of dialogue structures within iambic poems (as well as in lyric poetry as a whole), it should be noted that they resemble the epic presentation of dialogues rather than dialogue lines spoken by characters in drama. In surviving iambic fragments, statements of a person quoted in *oratio recta* are often preceded by an introductory verse, and followed by a concluding verse, often a formula of the type: *τοσαῦτ' ἐφώνει τὴν δ' ἐγὼ ἀνταμειβόμεν*.²⁷ Such introductory and concluding lines recall epic formulas used many times by epic poets. Therefore traces of exchanges of the form *I-you*, *I-(s)he* in iambic poems by no means prove dramatic presentation of these poems.

Of course, the possibility cannot be excluded that oral presentation of iambic poetry, like that of some genres of archaic Greek lyric, was accompanied by certain dramatic effects – gesture, facial movements, etc. These no doubt accompanied words spoken or sung²⁸ by an artist. We have evidence that rhapsodic performances were characterized by a high degree of emotion, the signs of which were lively gesticulation and expressive facial movements.²⁹ One can safely say that oral presentation was intended not only for aural, but also, to some extent, for visual perception. Plato in *Ion* gives much attention to his description of the appearance (dress, ornaments) and the behaviour of a performer. Therefore it seems that an oral presentation was in a way a spectacle in the literal sense of the word, i.e. a presentation whose components

¹⁹ But, of course, he does not reject this possibility. On the contrary, he thinks of this form of presentation, as of the very popular one. Cf. 'Melos', p. 86, *Studies*, p. 32.

²⁰ West, 'Melos', p. 86. ²¹ These are not relevant to the argument of this article.

²² F. Lasserre, 'Iambische Dichtung und antike Theorien ueber den Iambos bis Aristoteles', *Acta Philologica Aenipontana* 4 (1979), 59–61.

²³ *μάλιστα γὰρ λεκτικὸν τῶν μέτρων τὸ ἱαμβεῖον ἐστὶν· σημεῖον δὲ τούτου, πλείστα γὰρ ἱαμβεῖα λέγομεν ἐν τῇ διαλέκτῳ τῇ πρὸς ἀλλήλους...* (Kassel).

²⁴ *τὸ γὰρ ἡρωικὸν στασιμώτατον καὶ ὀγκωδέστατον τῶν μέτρων ἐστὶν [...]* τὸ δὲ ἱαμβεῖον καὶ τετράμετρον κινητικὰ καὶ τὸ μὲν ὀρχηστικὸν τὸ δὲ πρακτικόν (Kassel).

²⁵ Adrados, op. cit., pp. 315–17.

²⁶ Thus Lasserre's statement, op. cit., pp. 60–1, that Aristotle intended to say that iambi were an example of 'Buehndichtung' is a total misunderstanding.

²⁷ Fr. 196 a W. of Archilochus = Pap. Col. 7511. For introductory formulas in surviving iambic pieces see O. Tsagarakis, *Self-expression in Early Greek Lyric, Elegiac and Iambic Poetry* (Wiesbaden, 1977), pp. 32, 36, 148. ²⁸ See Appendix.

²⁹ Cf. Pl. *Ion* 541b8. For the presence of gesture during rhapsodic performances see R. Velardi, *Enthousiasmos. Possessione rituale e teoria della comunicazione poetica in Platone* (Roma, 1989), pp. 13–43.

were not only λέξις but also ὄψις (as well as μελοποιία). It is only in this sense that the oral presentation of iambic poetry was certainly a dramatic performance.

Ancient theoretical sources do not prove that literary iambi were presented dramatically, i.e. that they employed *dramatis personae* and choruses, in the way that comedies used them on the stage.³⁰ The fact that grotesque choruses were widespread in Greece,³¹ in Doric as well as in Ionian areas, does not mean that pieces presented by them in dialogue form were identical with literary iambi. Moreover the theory concerning the influence of the so-called Doric farce, i.e. of poems recognized as dramatic compositions in which some iambic content can be observed,³² on Attic comedy, which in turn has much in common with Ionian iambus³³ (above all invective and obscenity), finds no confirmation either in literary or in archaeological sources.³⁴

But the text from Aristotle's *Politics*, can, it seems, give some indication about the performance practice of literary iambi.³⁵ Here Aristotle calls the recipients of iambi spectators (θεαταί). Aristotle thus suggests that the reception of iambic poems was not restricted only to listening to their words. Aristotle does not give a full account of the elements of iambic performance which affect an audience's visual perception. It does not seem, however, that he had in mind a dramatic spectacle with all the elements typical of comedy because he himself distinguishes iambic presentations from comedies (οὐτ' ἰάμβων οὔτε κωμῳδίας θεατάς). Moreover, when elsewhere (*Po.* 1449b7–9) he deals with the origins of comedy, he suggests that ἰαμβικὴ ἰδέα was present in these poems, which include invective without using λόγοι and μῦθοι (understood here as structural parts of dramatic pieces).

When Lysanias (*ap.* Ath. 14.620c) refers to iambic performance he uses the verb ὑποκρίνεσθαι. This does not mean, however, that in such performances actors

³⁰ On the contrary, Tzetzes says explicitly (*ad Exeg. Il. schol. in A 1*, I A, pp. 12f. Hermann): οἱ δὲ ἀνεπικαλύπτως καὶ δίχα χωρῶν καὶ προσώπων ὑβρίζοντες ἰαμβογράφοι καλοῦνται... Thus he definitely rejects the dramatized presentation of iambi. Of course a text of the Byzantine period remains for us a document of very little value.

³¹ Cf. West, 'Melos', pp. 74–88.

³² For the character of Dorian farce see L. Breitholz, 'Die dorische Farce im griechischen Mutterland vor dem 5. Jahrhundert. Hypothese oder Realitaet?', *Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis* 66 (1960), 31–83.

³³ Common characteristics of iambi and Attic comedy have been enumerated by West, *Studies*, p. 37: 'iambic and trochaic metres; the projections of a vulgar or pretentious character by performers who may have worn the phallus; abuse of the grand and famous by the lowly, the classes of people mocked including priests or seers (...), military leaders and statesmen (...), doctors (...), musicians (...), homosexuals (...), ascetics (...), gluttons (...); parody of serious poetry; plenty of sex; much about food and cooking.' See also J. Henderson, *The Maculate Muse. Obscene Language in Attic Comedy* (New Haven–London, 1975), pp. 17, 19, and R. M. Rosen, *Old Comedy and the Iambographic Tradition* (Atlanta, 1988), pp. 9–35.

³⁴ See Breitholz, *op. cit.* 124: 'Eine Farce im Sinne eines scherzhaften Ensembledramas mit gesprochenen Dialog anhand literarischen Materials im dorischen Gebiet des griechischen Mutterlandes nicht fuer eine so fruehe Periode nachgewiesen werden kann, dass sie von Bedeutung fuer die Entstehung der attischen Komoedie sein koennte', and p. 181: 'Vor dem 5. Jahrhundert wuerden somit im eigentlichen Griechenland sowohl literarische wie archaeologische Beweise fuer eine dorische Farce in der Bedeutung eines scherzhaften Ensembledramas mit gesprochenen Dialog fehlen.'

³⁵ Although an earlier source is known giving information about details of iambic performance, i.e. Mnesiepes' inscription (Monumentum Parium E 1 Col. III, ed. M. Treu, *Archilochos* (Munich, 1959), p. 46), which suggests choral singing of Archilochus' poem fr. 251 W. (this thought is expressed by the utterance τινὰς τῶν πολιτῶν (line 21) if one assumes it depends directly on διδάξαντα (line 22), as is probable). For the verb διδάσκειν with reference to choral performance see Herington, *Poetry*, pp. 24, 183. We do not know whether fr. 251 W. of Archilochus is a ritual song, as Burnett thinks, A. P. Burnett, *Three Archaic Poets. Archilochus. Alcaeus. Sappho* (London, 1983), p. 6 or a purely literary work.

(ὑποκριταί) participated, in the sense of persons interpreting a part in dramas. Ὑποκρίνεσθαι can also mean 'explain', 'interpret',³⁶ or simply 'deliver a speech', 'declaim',³⁷ not only 'speak in dialogue', 'play a part', and consequently 'be an actor'. With reference to the rhapsodic performances about which Lysanias is talking, the usage of the verb ὑποκρίνεσθαι might have been intended to stress lively delivery of words, emotional gestures, and facial movements of a rhapsode. This behaviour is also mentioned by Plato in a similar context.³⁸ It cannot be excluded that Lysanias put the 'stage' connotation of the verb ὑποκρίνεσθαι to good account, in order to stress that a performer of iambi assumes a certain part and speaks on behalf of someone other than he really is. In this way the performer becomes, to some extent, a ὑποκριτής,³⁹ since he does not express ideas in *propria persona* but takes the role of another person.

To sum up, it is highly probable that archaic iambi were presented during the sort of public gatherings that might provide an audience for a rhapsode, and at symposia, which were less formal occasions for presenting this kind of poetry. We must also conclude that iambus was a narrative rather than a dramatic genre. The lack of ancient sources from the archaic period precludes offering this conclusion as a decisive solution of the problem. However it seems that, for reasons noted at the beginning of this article, sources from the fourth century B.C. offer a reliable basis for the reconstruction of the performance of iambic poetry in the archaic period.

Adam Mickiewicz University,
Poznań, Poland

KRYSTYNA BARTOL

APPENDIX

The problem of the manner of performance of iambi cannot be pursued further here. I should only mention here that, in the light of ancient testimonies, archaic iambus was a melic genre (apart from the most often quoted text by Ps.-Plutarch, *Mus.* 1141a,⁴⁰ this fact is proved by Plato, *Lg.* 11, 935e who says *τινος ἰάμβων ... μελωδίας*). Against scholars who accept the theory of the gradual separation of verbal and musical elements over the years within iambi,⁴¹ my opinion is that as early as the archaic period several types of iambic presentation coexisted, i.e. melic, semi-melic (*παρακαταλογή*) and non-melic, although for this last we have no clear ancient evidence. Choosing one of these might have been conditioned, among other things, by the metrical form of the poems. Iambi composed in trochaic and epodic metres are more likely to have been sung, since these patterns might have been understood as the simplest strophic forms.⁴² Iambic trimeters, described by the ancients themselves as

³⁶ This meaning occurs in Homer, *Od.* 19.535, 555 with reference to an interpreter of dreams.

³⁷ Cf. Arist. *Rh.* 1414b23, Ath. 14.620d, Luc. *Ps.* 25 referring to rhetoric.

³⁸ For this problem see B. Zucchelli, *ΥΠΟΚΡΙΤΗΣ, Origine e storia del termine* (Brescia, 1962), pp. 49ff., esp. n. 88.

³⁹ Cf. Herington, *Poetry*, pp. 52, 54.

⁴⁰ *Ἐτι δὲ τῶν ἰαμβείων τὸ τὰ μὲν λέγεσθαι παρὰ τὴν κρούσιν τὰ δ' ᾄδεσθαι Ἀρχιλόχον φασι καταδείξαι* (... they say that Archilochus introduced for iambics the mixed recitation of some and singing of others, both to an accompaniment ...), translation by B. Einarson, Ph. H. de Lacy, *Plutarch's Moralia* xiv (London, 1967), p. 417.

⁴¹ W. Schmid and O. Staehlin, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur*, I 1 (Munich, 1929), pp. 327, 338, J. J. Donohue, *The Theory of Literary Kinds*, ii (Dubuque-Iowa, 1949), p. 169, J. M. Edmonds, *Elegy and Iambus with The Anacreontea* (London-Cambridge, Mass.), ²1968, p. 1.

⁴² Cf. A. M. Dale, 'Stichos and Stanza', *CQ* 56 (1963), 46-7 (= *Collected Papers*, Cambridge, 1969, pp. 173-4).

λεκτικώτατα, might have been recited. Paracataloge, as a form of intermediate between melic and non-melic performance, might have been used in the case of both trochaic and iambic patterns.⁴³

Among other factors which might have influenced the choice of the manner of performance, the occasion of performance must also be taken into consideration, as can be deduced from Ps.-Aristotle's text (*Probl.* 19.6 Bekker). The author says that in drama παρακαταλογή engenders a certain effect (τραγικόν) which involves contrast (ἀνωμαλία) – here with the lyric, i.e. sung parts of dramas. Perhaps it would be reasonable to extend this observation to archaic iambic poetry, with one reservation: in the case of drama the contrast relates to the inner structure of one work (sung or spoken parts of drama); in the case of iambi the contrast might have concerned the 'external' circumstances of performance; the paracataloge might be chosen in order to make the contrast with the manner of performance of a poem which preceded an iambic composition (e.g. the previous poem was sung or recited without any musical accompaniment). If this hypothesis is true, the use of paracataloge was connected with the realization of rules of variety in presenting various types of artistic production. Of course, ἀνωμαλία must have also been manifested by the content of poems: this is suggested by the beginning of an elegiac couplet, Theogn. 1055f., which seems to refer to the change of the subject of poems during a sympotic performance.

⁴³ Cf. F. Perusino, *Il tetrametro giambico catalettico nella commedia greca* (Roma, 1968), p. 27 who argues that 'la paracataloghé non richiedeva nel verso una struttura metrica particolare'. Although her conclusion pertains directly to the presentation of iambic parts of Aristophanes' plays, it also may, as it seems, be referred to paracataloge in general.