

ARCHILOCHUS FIGHTING IN THASOS
FRR. 93a+94 FROM THE SOSTHENES INSCRIPTION

Some time ago, I attempted to interpret some trochaic fragments of Archilochus, mainly fr. 93a and 94 from the Sosthenes inscription, and 115 W., the Leophilus polyptoton¹. With regard to the inscription, I depended on the drawing of Luebke in Hiller von Gaertringen's *IG* edition and, chiefly, on the text established in West's *IEG*, which was, no doubt, the most trustworthy source². In former editions, the readings were so widely divergent that it was impossible to form even a tentative text based upon them. Second thoughts, however, and, mainly, meticulous examination of the Sosthenes inscription (*IG* XII 5.445 [+ Suppl. p. 212; *SEG* 15.518]), though verifying or supporting some of my conjectures, considerably altered the text I had then proposed and, accordingly, its interpretation, so that I thought it worthwhile to publish the new readings or proposals for the lower part of col. A I (lines 40-59), which contains the two fragments. I remind that the inscription, written quite inelegantly in the first century B.C., was almost destructively reused as a tombstone in the third century A.D. Some of the damages are completely irreparable but, in many places, the abrading of the original inscription left some traces, more or less readable³. However, I must admit that, even now, it has proved, for several reasons, impossible to study the stone itself. Luckily, I availed myself of three squeezes made by W. Peek and a large photograph prepared for Wilamowitz, property of the *Inscriptiones Graecae*, Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften. All were most kindly placed at my disposal by Prof. Klaus Hallof, Arbeitsstellenleiter of the *Inscriptiones Graecae*, to whom I wish to express my sincerest thanks. I regret that the condition of the inscription and the squeezes renders the publication of clear and legible photographs impossible.

1. In *Κτερίσματα. Φιλολογικά Μελετήματα αφιερωμένα στον Ιωάννη Σ. Καμπίτση (1938-1990)*, Herakleion (Crete) 2000, pp. 369-393.

2. Concerning fr. 93a, West depended partly on G. Klaffenbach's readings, as they appear in Lasserre's apparatus, whereas for fr. 94 on the readings of P. Maas, *NGG* 1934, 56.

3. For the structure of the Sosthenes inscription see A. Chaniotis, *Historie und Historiker in den griechischen Inschriften*, Stuttgart 1988, pp. 32-34, 57-68, 103-112, with further literature.

- 40 υ..αδε[]έγραφον δὲ τοσ[αὔτα ἀντ-
 41 ἀλλαγα, τοὺς Θασ[ίου]ς ἐῶσιν Πάριοι ἔαυ[τοὺς πάλιν
 42 ἀποκαθιστάν[αι ἐνθάδ]ε. διασαφεῖ δὲ τα[ῦτα πάν-
 43 τα αὐτὸς ..[]α.
 (fr.93a) «τ[ίς] φυλ[άξιεν |⁴⁴ τὸ χοῖλον; [πῆι 'πικωλύ]σαις πάθο[ς];
 εἰ| γὰρ ἀσχαλᾶ[ς |⁴⁵ τροφῆι σ[φι, τοῦ] ξ[ν]εκεμ προσήγομεν;»
 ὦν τὸ λάβρον |⁴⁶ εἶπ' ἑάσ[ας μ]ητρίπαις Πεισιστράτου·
 «ἄνδρας ἀ[ρ]ρω|⁴⁷δεῦντας αὐλὸν καὶ λύρην ἀνήγαγον
 5 εἰς Θάσον φυσι |⁴⁸ Θρήξιν δῶρ' ἔχων ἀκήρατον
 χρυσόν· οἰκείως |⁴⁹ δὲ κέρδει ξύν' ἐποίησαν κακά.»
 ὅτι τοὺς Θραῖκας
- 50 ἀποκτείναντες αὐτοὶ οἱ μὲν αὐτῶν ὑπὸ Παρί-
 51 ὦν ἀπώλοντο, οἱ δ' εἰς τὰς Σάπας ὑπὸ τῶν Θρα-
 52 κῶν. μετὰ ταῦτα πάλιν γίνεται ἄρχων Ἄμ-
 53 φίτιμος· καὶ ἐν τούτοις διασαφεῖ πάλιν ὡς
 54 ἐνίκησαν καρτερῶς τοὺς Ναξίους λέγων
 55 οὔτω·
 (fr. 94) τῶν δὲ Ἀθηναίη μάχη
 ἴλαος παρασταθεῖσα |⁵⁶παῖς ἐρικτύπου Διὸς
 καρδίην ὠτρυνεν αὐτῆς τῆς πολυ|⁵⁷χλαύτου λεῶ·
 τὰ ἴγλιπῶν, εἰ κάλεγεινῆς ἡμέρης, ἐπαχ|⁵⁸[θ]εᾶ
 5 ἄλλ' ὀνειδίσεν· τόσους γὰρ ἐξεχώρησεν γύας,
 νηλε|⁵⁹[γέ]ως ἅπαντας· ἀλλὰ θεῶν Ὀλυμπίων νόωι
 νη[

The observations that follow are limited to the new or different readings. A comprehensive examination of the inscription's problems will still call for recourse to older editions.

40. The low horizontal and the foot of the upright of the second E are clear. Of ΓΡ only two feet of uprights are visible, after which a short low oblique might be identified as the lefthand characteristic bottom serif of A.

41. A more or less certain λαγα is visible, before which a descending oblique can only be the righthand stroke of A. It is uncertain if the lightly slanting stroke following Θ belongs to P or to A, but the low horizontal that follows may belong only to Σ, therefore Θασ[, not Θρα[, is necessary. If Θασίους, the size of the word would be equal or slightly shorter than 54 Ναξίους. After the lacuna, the end of a top horizontal compatible with Σ, then E followed by a certain Ω.

42. It seems that originally the engraver wrote ΑΠΟΚΑΤΙΣΤΑΣΘ, which he later corrected to ΑΠΟΚΑΘΙΣΤΑΝ with the second Θ scraped away. After the lacuna, a top horizontal free in its righthand end, like Γ or E.

43. Following ΑΥΤΟΣ, two letters with top acute angles: ΑΔ, ΔΑ, ΑΛ, ΛΑ are all possible; not ΑΡ.

44. Of the initial Υ only a faint horizontal is visible. The letter following Θ is extremely uncertain, as it is jumbled up with the late carvings of the stone, but must have had a lefthand vertical with rightward extensions: K? Then OIAO is more or less clear. N is visible only in the photograph. After a distance of ± 7 letters, ΣΑΙΣ . The low horizontal of Σ is clear. There follows a large Π , a faint Λ , and the tops of ΘO , already noticed by Klaffenbach (in Lasserre's apparatus). Then, ΓΑΡΑΞΧ (X possibly corrected from Λ or vice versa). The last three visible letters have angled tops like Λ , Λ ; the first is certainly Λ .

45. ΤΡΟΦΗΙΣ . After a c.5 letter gap, the low right angle of E , then, after an erased letter, ΕΚΕΜΠ . There follows the foot of a vertical, an O , a high and a low horizontal (Σ), two verticals, a high horizontal, an O , a large letter, of which a vertical is visible; then EN . After ΤΟΛΑ , a vertical with a top roundel, then a relatively low roundel; apparently BP . Then, ON . The traces of the last four letters are visible only in the photograph.

46. After ΕΙΠΕΑΣ (undotted), there is space for more than two large letters. Then, the foot of a vertical, two faint uprights with a conspicuous crossbar, certainly H , then a more or less certain TPI . Can a circular hole on I be an attempt at correcting iota to omicron? At the end, $\Lambda \Omega$; from the letter before Ω there survives the angled bottom serif, apparently, of a vertical.

47. ΔΕΥΝΤΑΣ . The opening Δ is certain. The top horizontal of the first Γ of ΑΝΗΓΑΓΟΝ is faintly visible, but certain; not ΑΝΗΡΑΓΟΝ or -ΓΩΝ . At the end, ΦΥΣΙ ; the fork of Υ is visible, but the closing I is uncertain.

56. ΩΤΡΥΝΕΝ with Peek, not ΩΡΕΙΝΕΝ with Maas.

57. Of the opening Κ ($\chi\lambda\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$) only the oblique strokes are visible. ΤΑΓΛ is hardly visible, but certain. I is usually read Y , but the lefthand prong of the supposed Y is no more than the righthand oblique of Λ . Π looks like T , but this is due to the scribe's peculiar Π with a third middle upright, which here happens to be intensely marked. E also looks like T (only in the photograph), because of a random spot under the middle of the upper horizontal, but must be certain. Of I , the only letter that might be accommodated in the space, only the top end is visible. Of K the obliques are better visible. X (not Y) is visible at the end of the line. $\text{X}\Theta$ is read in the papyrus.

58. Of E only the bottom horizontal is visible. Of Δ the base horizontal and the righthand oblique are certain.

59. The missing letters are ± 2 . Then, uncertain traces of two letters. The first Λ of $\alpha\pi\alpha\nu\tau\alpha\varsigma$ (under $\alpha\Lambda\Lambda$) is clearly visible; the third one too (not παντός).

By reading τοσ[]αλλαγα , we can get rid of $\text{τὸν [χρυσὸν] | πάντα}$ or $[\dots \chi\rho\eta\mu]ατα$, as well as of the restoration of the gold or the money back to the Parians, which had been the prevailing interpretation so far. $\alpha\nu\tau\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ occurs three times only in Menander (fr. 20, 198, 404 K.-A.) in the sense «given in exchange for something», used predicatively in all three passages. Its weak attestation should not be considered a disadvantage, since Demeas, the chronicler whom Sosthenes has abridged in the present inscription, must have been a close contemporary of Menander. $\text{Ἰεγραφοῦν δὲ τοσ[αὔτα ἀντ]άλλαγα}$ must refer to a neuter plural noun mentioned earlier, possibly $\chi\omega\rho\iota\alpha$. The verb, a compound of $\gamma\rho\acute{\alpha}\phi\epsilon\iota\nu$, perhaps περιέγραφοῦν ,

must denote how the boundaries of the territories were determined. I would translate: «They delimited so large (areas to be given) in exchange». The subject is the Parians.

ἐῶσιν also changes the situation altogether. It appears that the Thasians are the former Thracian-born inhabitants of Thasos, whom the Parians had previously driven out of the island. Now, the Parians agree to bring them back into Thasos, allow them to settle again there, and offer them large estates in exchange for something that will soon become clear.

Since αὐτὸς Ἀρχίλοχος is ruled out in line 43, one might propose *exempli gratia*, αὐτὸς λα[μπρῶς λέγων ταῦτα], «himself openly, without concealment, saying the following»; cf. Thuc. 8.67 λαμπρῶς ἐλέγετο. The sentence must not refer to a narrative in Archilochus' poem. «Himself openly saying» must allude to the expressly stated direct speech rhetoric questions of Archilochus in the first two verses of the fragment. Since, throughout the inscription, the subject of verbs that denote recounting of events (λέγει, δηλοῖ, διασαφεῖ) is Archilochus, his name need not be repeated in each item. However, many more conjectures are possible.

In fr. 93a, second-person ἴκνωλ]σαις and ἀσχαλᾶ[ς might indicate that what we are dealing with is an interlocution, but both verbs are, more or less, produced by conjecture. However, ἀνήγαγον is certain, and, combined with ἔχων, it can only be first person singular. Thus, it becomes clear that two persons are exchanging words in direct speech. The second of them is named in the verse preceding his speech: εἶπ' ... μ]ητρίπαις Πεισιστράτου, «said the ... son of Peisistratus». The first remains unnamed in the surviving verses, but, on one hand, the habitual poetic usage and, on the other, the insulting innuendoes thrown out by the son of Peisistratus (ἄνδρας ἀ[ρ]ρωδεῦντας αὐλὸν καὶ λύρην; cf. in fr. 94 ονειδισεν) identify him beyond doubt as the poet.

Archilochus seems to wrangle with the son of Peisistratus, whom he considers responsible for some disaster (πάθος) suffered by his own people at a valley (κοῖλον) which, naturally, could not be guarded. Since there was no guard, the disaster must not involve human losses, but damages done in the valley, apparently in the fields and flocks of the Parians. Thasos, being mountainous and wooded, has no extended plains, its cultivated lands being limited to areas near the coast and, mainly, in few and short valleys. And since, after this disaster, the son of Peisistratus is, in Archilochus' words, being distressed over providing with food some people whom the Parians had brought into the island (προσῆγομεν), the situation starts becoming clear. The particulars will be shown later, but we may reasonably surmise that the people brought into the island were the Thracian-born Thasians and that it was they who did the damages to the Parian properties, because of lack of

provisions. But why were they brought back to Thasos? The exchange mentioned in the introductory prose, the fact that they or, rather, their leaders had to be bribed in order to agree, the fact that the incident is mentioned in connexion with the war with the Naxians, and the outcome of the battle described in the prose text of lines 49-55, all lead to the conjecture that the Thasians were offered the right to resettle in Thasos on the condition that they would side with the Parians in the fight against the Naxians. On the war against the Naxians, see Marcaccini 178 ff.

93a. 1 (43 f.). For simple optative in questions expecting a negative answer see Garvie, on Aesch. *Cho.* 591-3 (*ibid.* 595 τίς λέγοι;, Soph. *Ant.* 605 τίς ... ὑπερβασία κατάσχοι;). φυλάξαιτ' ἄν is impossible, because the middle φυλάσσομαι, in the sense «to guard something», is irregular. [πῆμι πικωλύ]σαις is given, of course, *exempli gratia*, for the sense «how could you prevent», but the supplement has exactly the size of the gap, especially if the interrogative was written, as usually, πῆ.

2 (44 f.). ἀσχάλλ[εις is equally possible, but Archilochus uses at 128.6 the imperative ἀσχάλα (*metri causa?*). He construes it there with the dative (κακοῖσιν). τροφή, in the sing. = «the means of maintaining an army, provisions» (*LSJ*). Archilochus is here blaming his interlocutor for being distressed over providing the Thasians with food. It seems that the situation is identical with the one described at Thuc. 8.57, where Tissaphernes looks after τροφήν παρέχειν to the Peloponnesians, because ἐφοβεῖτο μάλιστα μὴ τῆς τροφῆς ζητήσῃ πορθήσωσι τὴν ἡπειρον.

τοῦ] ἔ[ν]εκεμ προσήγομεν;: τοῦ may be either demonstrative, «is this what we brought (them) for?», or interrogative, «what did we bring (them) for?». Though the difference is immaterial, the first seems slightly more germane to the conditional phrase that precedes.

3 (45 f.). The verse is introductory to the direct speech words of the son of Peisistratus. τὸ λάβρον combines greediness with violence. Cf. Thuc. 7.29, where the πάθος inflicted upon the Mycalessians by the Thracian mercenaries of Athens in the summer of 413 B.C. is recounted: τὸ γὰρ γένος τὸ τῶν Θρακῶν ὁμοῖα τοῖς μάλιστα τοῦ βαρβαρικοῦ, ἐν ᾧ ἂν θαρσῆση, φονικώτατόν ἐστιν. Here, unlike Mycalessus, the Thracians do not seem to have engaged in slaughtering, but the πάθος is strong enough to characterize the victims as πολύκλαυτος λεῶς (94.3) just as the Mycalessian πάθος is described by Thucydides as οὐδενὸς ... ἦσσαν ὀλοφύρασθαι ἄξιον.

ἔάω, «concede, allow in argument», is recorded in *LSJ* only from Pl. *Prm.* 135b, but here it may well have the usual sense «let alone, let be». The son of Peisistratus sidesteps the main issue of the acts of the Thracians and is

worrying only about providing them with food or, much worse, with land, as mentioned in lines 40 f. and in fr. 94.

μητρίπαις is new. It must be equivalent to the late μαμμόθρεπτος, «mama's boy», scornfully used for a pampered and delicate man. One should expect μητρόπαις, but the dative in the flectional compound may suggest close relationship and belonging, «boy to his mother». On the other hand a circular hole on the iota of μητρίπαις may represent an attempt at correcting it to μητρόπαις⁵.

4 (46 f.). ἄ[ρ]ρωδεῦντας αὐλὸν καὶ λύρην: «Shrinking from the pipe and the lyre». The contemptuous remark is personally aimed at Archilochus. The son of Peisistratus ironically describes the men he brought to Thasos as dreading the weapons of the poet, which were, supposedly, the pipe and the lyre. «I brought here crude men to fight on our side, not refined music-lovers you would approve of». Similar, but not identical, is the contemptuous remark of Telemachus for the suitors: *Od.* 1.159 τοῦτοισιν μὲν ταῦτα μέλει, κίθαρις καὶ ἀοιδή. For the literal use of instruments in the delivery of Archilochus' poems, possibly not only the epodes, see, e.g., fr. 121 αὐτὸς ἐξάρχων πρὸς αὐλὸν Λέσβιον παιήονα, 58.12 αἰδῶν ὑπ' αὐλητῆρος, though, at least in the second, it is not certain that the subject is the poet, and cf. Theocr. *ep.* 21.5 f. ὡς ἐμμελής τ' ἐγένετο (sc. Ἀρχίλοχος) κῆπιδέξιος | ἔπεά τε ποιεῖν πρὸς λύραν τ' αἰεῖδεν. Ps.-Plutarch, *De mus.* 28.1140 f - 1141 b, claims that the Parian προσεξεῦρε not only several rhythms, but also τὴν περι ταῦτα κροῦσιν, «the instrumental music conjoined with them»; also, τῶν ἱαμβείων τὸ τὰ μὲν λέγεσθαι παρὰ τὴν κροῦσιν τὰ δ' αἰδεσθαι Ἀρχίλοχόν φασι καταδειξαι; further, οἴονται δὲ καὶ τὴν κροῦσιν τὴν ὑπὸ τὴν ᾠδὴν τοῦτον εὔρειν.— Remarkable is the Ionic form ἀρρωδεῦντας.

ἀνάγειν is employed here technically for «bring back by sea», combining the senses «carry by sea» (*LSJ* I.2) and «bring back» (II.1); Archilochus himself uses at line 2 the more generic προσάγειν.

5 (47 f.). Luebke's drawing in Hiller's *IG* edition shows clearly ΦΙΣΙ. Von Arnim proposed φωσί, and this was what Hiller initially accepted. Later Hiller proposed κωσί, a proposal that prevailed, though he had himself noted in *IG* «Φ.Σ certa». But the Thracians, though ferocious, were not hounds. The inscription has clearly enough ΦΥΣΙ. φύσι Θρηίξι would mean both «Thracian-born» and «Thracians by nature». Or, possibly, φῦσι (dat. pl. of the participle φύς) Θρηίξι, with the same meaning.

δῶρ' ἔχων: I suppose that the pure gold was intended not for the whole

5. μητρόπαις is used by Isid. *Thess.*, 25 (Mi.), for Virgin Mary, both mother and child of God.

population of the Thracians of Thasos, but for their leaders, and not as presents but as bribes, which was the technical sense of the plural δῶρα at least in Attica (*LSJ* s.v. I.2; cf. δωροδόκος, -κέω).

6 (48 f.). Wilamowitz emended the inscription's οἰκείως ... κέρδει to οἰκείωι ... κέρδει, an emendation which also prevailed. *Theogn.* 46 οἰκείων κερδέων εἵνεκα seemed to be an exact parallel, and οἰκείωι κέρδει seemed to form a direct contrast to the ξυνὰ κακά. However, οἰκείως ought to be connected with φύσι or φῦσι Θρηγγίωι. The fierce behaviour of the Thracians was in accordance with their temper, which was characterized by greed and rapacity (κέρδος, *LSJ* «desire of gain»).

Ξύν' ἐποίησαν κακά: Cf. *Il.* 16.262 ξυὸν δὲ κακὸν πολέεσσι τιθεῖσι, about the thoughtless children who by teasing a swarm of wasps on the road are harming not only themselves but other people too. The Thracians were supposed to harm the Naxians, but they damaged the property of the Parians too.

Apparently, the poem was not a straight-line patriotic narrative of the battle, a poetic chronicle, but was garnished with the typically Archilochean criticism of the leaders' decisions. Archilochus' attitude towards the Parian military and political magistrates is more or less hostile and satirical. When Critias (88 B 44 D.-K., from *Ael. VH* 10.13; *Archil. fr.* 295 W.) blames the poet for revealing in his work ὅτι ἔλθων (εἰς Θάσον) τοῖς ἐνταῦθα ἐχθρὸς ἐγένετο, and ὅτι ὁμοίως τοὺς φίλους καὶ τοὺς ἐχθροὺς κακῶς ἔλεγε, he does not mean Archilochus' hostile attitude towards the enemy, whether Thracians or others, an attitude which by no means could be considered blameworthy, but towards his Parian compatriots and, mainly, their leadership. This attitude is manifest, at least from his trochaic poems, in fr. 114 (οὐ φιλέω μέγαν στρατηγὸν κτλ.), which describes pejoratively a warlord who remains unspecified in the fragment – though the circumstantial depiction of particularized features clearly shows that he is a real person –, and in fr. 115, the Leophilus polyptoton, which satirizes an archon, possibly comparing him with a predecessor (νῦν δὲ Λεώφιλος μὲν ἄρχει κτλ.)⁶.

A great portion of the blame for misunderstanding the fragments must go to the current interpretation of the first sentence of the prose text 49-52, ὅτι τοὺς Θρηῶνας κτλ. It is considered a causal sentence, which the author, whether Demeas or Sosthenes, connected with the last sentence of the poetic fragment for explaining what the ξυνὰ κακά mentioned by Archilochus consisted in⁷. This is the reason why editors either leave the end of fr. 93a

6. I trust that my interpretation of the polyptoton (*Κτερίσματα*, above n. 1) is still valid.

7. Cf. Marcaccini, *ib.*, pp. 146, 169 n. 2.

unpunctuated (Lasserre) or punctuate with a comma (Treu) or a dash (West, Gerber). But if the poetic text were to be syntactically connected with the prose, then ἐποίησαν and ἀποκτείναντες would necessarily share the same subject. Since, however, as we have seen so far, those who ξύν ἐποίησαν κακά in the poetic text are the Thracians, then, it must also be the Thracians who killed the Thracians in the prose text. As far as I can see, it was only A. J. Podlecki who took the ὅτι-sentence as a statement and translated «[Demeas tells] that», though with entirely different text and interpretation, and on the assumption that the verb was omitted by the stonemason⁸. Actually, ὅτι introduces captions of Sosthenes' compendium, as is very usually done in late chronicles, where separate sections are introduced with ὅτι⁹. Other ὅτι-sentences in the same inscription are also statements, depending, however, on δηλοῖ ὁ ποιητής or similar expressions (IV 6, 20, 26). Therefore, I believe that the sentence ὅτι τοὺς Θοῤῃκας κτλ. does not explain the last sentence of fr. 93a, but describes the situation following the one described in the previous section. The Thracian-born Thasians the son of Peisistratus brought to Thasos were decimated by the Naxians. But the latter were partly destroyed on Thasos by the Parians and partly by the Sapaian Thracians on the mainland, where they had fled from the Parian threat. The next Archilochus fragment (94 W.), imperfectly surviving, must have been employed as a witness to these deadly operations.

The addition of φυγόντες by West (οἱ δ' εἰς τὰς Σάπας <φυγόντες>) is welcome, as regards sense, but perhaps unnecessary, since the motion is already implied by εἰς; K.-G. II.1.543, referred to by Jensen. Jensen also keenly designated τὰς Σάπας as a place-name. Perhaps no town is meant («oppidum» West), but the mainland district opposite Thasos. It is from there that the son of Peisistratus «carried back by sea» the Thracians to Thasos and it is there that the fleeing Naxians met their disaster in the hands of other Thracians. Whether the Sapaian are the same tribe as the Saioi of Archil. fr. 5, as Strabo, 10.2.17, 12.3.20, assures, one cannot say¹⁰.

Demeas presents the direct speech altercation between the poet and the son of Peisistratus as undoubted evidence not merely of the historicity of the events, but also of their specific date, in the year of a certain archon. This archon must, presumably, be Amphitimus, if μετὰ ταῦτα πάλιν γίνεται ἄρ-

8. *Phoenix* 28 (1974) 7 and n. 40.

9. Also in Scholia: E. G. Turner, *Greek Papyri*, 114 f. Even sections of Athenaeus' *Epitome* are introduced with ὅτι.

10. The modern town Sapai, far to the east of Greek Thrace, is a rather unlucky renaming of the Turkish village name Sapçı or Sapçiler («hilt-makers»). Formerly, Sari Saban (Golden Plough), now Chrysoupolis near Kavala, had been more pertinently renamed Sapaioi.

χων Ἀμφίτιμος implies that he had also been archon in the preceding year. Though the sense of πάλιν is clear, I greatly doubt if μετὰ ταῦτα is temporal denoting a typical succession. I suspect that its meaning is «subsequently», «in consequence». In spite of Archilochus' manifest antipathy to him, Amphitimus was nominated an archon for a second term, because the destruction of both Naxians and Thracians was credited to him by the Parian nobility, who, as it seems, decided the renewal of the archonship. Actually, since Demeas' source seems to be none other than Archilochus, it is, I believe, safe to consider the son of Peisistratus as this specific archon, i.e. Amphitimus¹¹.

94.1 (55). τῶν is connected with μάχη probably as an objective genitive, as is usually the genitive depending on nouns such as μάχη, πόλεμος, and the like (= «in the battle against them»; cf. fr. 125 μάχης δὲ τῆς σῆς).

2 (55). ἴλαος παρασταθεῖσα: The participle governs μάχη. Athena was not impartial; she sided favourably with one of the fighting parties.

3 (56 f.). αὐτῆς τῆς πολυκλαύτου λεῶ: The vexed question in this passage is the unparalleled feminine gender of λεῶς. Hiller von Gaertringen reminded the sarcastic address of the Achaeans by Agamemnon (*Il.* 2.235) Ἀχαιῖδες οὐκέτ' Ἀχαιοί. West¹², added the parallel of vase-inscriptions, such as ἡ παῖς καλός, Ἴπποδάμας καλή¹³, and the joke in *Ar. Nub.* 680 (Κλεωνόμη for Κλεωνύμος). And Bonnard in Lasserre-Bonnard translated «peuple de femmes». However, I greatly doubt if αὐτῆς τῆς or simply τῆς should be connected epithetically or articularly to πολυκλαύτου λεῶ. The effect of the poet's speaking of his own miserable people in so crudely derisive terms, and that not after some shameful defeat but at the moment of the divine intervention for assisting them, would be really grotesque. But neither is any emendation needed¹⁴. What the sense demands is the genitive of a feminine reflexive pronoun (αὐτῆς τῆς = ἑαυτῆς) standing for the subject of the period, which is Ἀθηναίη, ... παῖς ἔρικτύπου Διός. The genitive must denote possession depending on πολυκλαύτου λεῶ, which is in turn also a possessive genitive from καρδίην: literally, «Athena incited the heart of the much-lamented people of herself». Since the period contains a contrast between «their» (τῶν) and «of herself», the reflexive pronoun must

11. Klaffenbach's reading in line 46]ων (susp. ιων) πάις Πεισιστράτου, accepted by West, leads naturally to the common name Ἴων, taken in synizesis (*Κτερίσματα*, above n. 1, p. 386 f.). But I now believe that the reading]ητρίπαις is certain.

12. *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus* 127.

13. Robinson-Fluck, *Greek Love Names*, pp. 11, 110, 119, 174.

14. αὐτῆς γῆς Steffen, αὐτῆ τοῦ Peek, αὐτῆς τῆς πολυκλαύτου νεῶν ἐπι Tarditi, αὐτῆς τῆς West, αὐτῆς (West) γῆς (Steffen) Gerber.

be emphatic. However, in the battle against the Naxians, Athena sided with her own people. This would mean that the Parians had a special connexion with Athena, so that they might consider themselves «her own people». The goddess is once more mentioned in the trochaic fragment 98.7 W. (παῖς Ἀθηναίη Διός; suppl. Maas) also from the Sosthenes inscription (A IV 47-8) again in the context of a battle or a siege. Now, excavations have revealed on the acropolis of Thasos a sanctuary of Athenaie Poliouchos, whose cult had apparently been transferred to the island from Paros, where the goddess, one of the principal deities of the homonymous city, was worshipped also on the acropolis as Athenaie Poliouchos¹⁵. There is no need, I believe, to point out that the exact sense of πολιοῦχος is less that of the protector than that of the proprietor of the city and the citizens. For instance, in Aeschylus' *Eumenides* not only is the city (Athens) named πόλις ἢ Παλλάδος (772, 1016; also *Pe.* 347) but also the citizens are Παλλάδος ἄστοί (1045); and Athena herself mentions τόποισι τοῖς ἑμοῖσι (858), χώραι τῆμῃ (968), but also ἑμοῖς ἄστοῖσιν (707 f., 862), whereas, in addressing her, Apollon speaks of τὸ σὸν πόλισμα καὶ στρατόν (668) and Orestes of τῶι σῶι στρατῶι (762).

I must admit, however, that I have found no exact parallel for a reflexive αὐτῆς τῆς. The inverse order of the reflexive pronoun, with the intensive αὐτός coming first, is not uncommon: *Od.* 4.244 αὐτόν μιν, Aesch. *PV* 86 αὐτόν γάρ σε, *Hdt.* 3.142 αὐτῶ τ' ἑμοί, *IG IV* 952.106 (*Epid.*) αὐτοῦ ἔθεν. The same inversion occurs in Archilochus' shield fragment, 5.3, where editors usually publish Hoffmann's conjecture αὐτόν δ' ἔξεσάωσα. However, the asyndeton αὐτόν μ' ἔξεσάωσα, the reading of the Neoplatonist Elias, *Proleg. Philos.* 8 (*Comm. in Arist. Graeca*, xviii.22.21), with a strong punctuation after 2, κάλλιπον οὐκ ἐθέλων, is far the most forceful and effective reading: «It is myself that I saved! Who cares about that shield?». Anyway, the other variants in the tradition of fr. 5 are either gross corruptions or paraphrases. In fr. 94, it is the fact that the possessive force of the reflexive pronoun demands an emphatic form (and not the «regular» ἐο - εὐ), that made the use of the demonstrative pronoun necessary. After all, the demonstrative is, as a rule, used also as third person personal pronoun, having in

15. Athena Poliouchos in Thasos: J. Pouilloux, *Recherches sur l'histoire et les cultes de Thasos*, I. *De la fondation de la cité à 196 avant J.-C.* [Études Thasiennes, III], Paris, École française d'Athènes, 1954, p. 37 no. 7 (6 Ἀθηναίη τῆι Πολιόχῳ), p. 40 no. 8 (Ἀθηναίη Πολιούχῳ), *IG XII Suppl.* 381 (3 Ἀθηναίη Πολιούχῳ), possibly also *IG XII* 8. 267.10. In Paros: *IG XII* 5.134 (17 Ἀθηναίης Πολιόχ[ο]), possibly also 1029.4/5. For the transfer of the cult from Paros to Thasos see Pouilloux, *Recherches*, i. 40, 47, 336, eund. in *Entretiens Hardt*, x (1964: *Archiloque*). 17-9, N. M. Kontoleon, ib. 34-5; O. Rubensohn, s. Paros, *RE XVIII* 2, 1842. Precisely this transfer to Thasos is considered by Rubensohn a sign of the oldness of the cult of Athena Poliouchos in Paros.

addition the advantage over οὖ, οἶ, εἶ of being subject to gender differentiation (ὁ, ἡ, τό - ὄς, ἡ, ὅ - αὐτός, -ή, -ό). The closest parallels to αὐτῆς τῆς are found in some West Greek dialects, where the genitive of the reflexive pronoun is αὐτᾶς αὐτᾶς, αὐταυτᾶς, αὐτοσαυτᾶς, αὐσαυτᾶς, αὐσωτᾶς, vel sim. Its occurrence in early Attic shows, however, that the phenomenon was more expanded: Fraenkel on Aesch. Ag. 836, τοῖς τ' αὐτὸς αὐτοῦ πῆμασιν βαρύνεται, «by his own sorrows», PV 762 πρὸς αὐτὸς αὐτοῦ κενοφρόνων βουλευμάτων (sc. συληθήσεται), «by his own plans», al.¹⁶. The genitive of that reflexive may well have a possessive force: Sophron fr. 19 αἰ δὲ μὴ ἐγὼν ἔμασσον ταῖς αὐταυτᾶς χερσί («with my own hands»), «Diotogenes» (H. Thesleff, *The Pythagorean Texts of the Hellenistic Period*, Åbo Akademi 1965) p. 72.28 ff. τὸν ἐτέρων ἄρχεν χηρίζοντα, τῶν αὐταυτῶ παθέων πρᾶτον δύνασθαι ἄρχεν, IC I:viii (Knossos), 12.7 ἀπήστελκε ... τὸν αὐτοσαυτῶ μαθητάν, FD III 2:48.4 τὸν αὐτοσαυτῶν δᾶμον τιμέ[οντ]ες, SIG 711 K.5 (Delph. in Attica) τοῦ τε θεοῦ καὶ τᾶς αὐτοσαυτοῦ ἀρετᾶ[ς]. It is remarkable that the Modern Greek ἀπαυτός - ἀπατός (μου, σου, του, etc.), direct product of αὐταυτός and meaning «myself, yourself, himself» etc., has also a possessive force in the genitive. From a Rhodian folk song: τρία παραθύρια στέκονται ἀργυροκαρφωμένα, | τό 'ναν εἶναι τῆς μάνας μου, τ' ἄλλο τῆς ἀδερφῆς μου, | τὸ τρίτο τὸ μικρότερο εἶναι τῆς ἀπαυτῆς μου («my own»)¹⁷. – The diaeresis between the two elements of the reflexive pronoun (αὐτῆς | τῆς) adds even more emphasis to the personal - demonstrative component.

πολύκλαυτος does not necessarily mean «weeping» (*LSJ* s.v. II, «much-lamenting»). In our case the adjective must be passive and mean «much-lamented» (*LSJ* s.v. I). For the fact that the mishaps of the colonists of Thasos were lamentable, the clearest testimony is given by Archilochus himself (fr. 20): κλαίω τὰ Θασίων, οὐ τὰ Μαγνήτων κακά.

4-5 (57 f.). τὰ ἔλιπών: The situation is still the poet's wrangle with Amphitimus, the son of Peisistratus, who must be the subject of ἐκλιπών. What the latter is accused of passing over in silence in the dispute (cf. 93a.3 ἐάσας) is the adverse position of the Parians in the operations that preceded. We do not know how long the passage describing their misfortunes was, but it is obvious that it was such a passage that closed with the reference to Athena's intervention. The guilt for these misfortunes must have been what Archilochus imputed to Amphitimus, and the poet must have expected an

16. K.-Bl. i.600 Anm. 5-6; Buck, *Greek Dialects*, §121.4.

17. See A. G. Tsopanakis, *Μιά δωρική ἀντωνυμία* (Αὐταυτός - ἀπατός μου, σου, του, ὁ ἀπαυτός), Rhodes 1948.

answer for them. – For the consonant assimilation in the inscription cf. above I 11 ἐγ Μιλῆτου, 45 ξ[ν]εκεμ προσ-.

εἰ κάλεγεινῆς ἡμέρης, ἐπαχ[θ]ῆα | ἄλλ' ὀνειδίσεν: If the reading is, as I trust, correct, the concessive clause must refer to the fact that the painful situation demanded a serious response to Archilochus' questions. Amphitimus, however, in spite of the grievous atmosphere, preferred to hurl grave offences at him, irrelevant to the subject discussed. No doubt, the reference is to the insults aiming at Archilochus' profession (ἄρρωδεῦντας αὐλὸν καὶ λύρην) or, possibly, other insults too, not included in the surviving verses. The poet is proud enough of his profession not to place it second to his martial activities: fr. 1,

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

(pace Athenaeus, who believes that Archilochus rates poetry second to his involvement in political contests). We do not know in what context this elegiac couplet was delivered, but, if the situation was similar to that of 73a and 74, καὶ with the participle ἐπιστάμενος may well have an adversative force: «though I am skilled in poetry». The emphatic μὲν of line 1, which must be connected with ἐγὼ, is employed, in the description of LSJ, «to give force to assertions made by a person respecting himself, wherein opposition to other persons is implied». In other words, «(I do not know what happens with other people, but) as far as I am concerned, being a poet does not prevent me from serving lord Enyalios». – For the augmentless ὀνειδίσεν cf. Hom. II. 9.34 ἀλκὴν μὲν μοι πρῶτον ὀνειδίσας ἐν Δαναοῖσι.

5-6 (58 f.). τόσους γὰρ ἐξεχώρησεν γύας, | νηλε[γέ]ως ἅπαντας: The γάρ-sentence does not account for ὀνειδίσεν, but for τὰ ἐκλιπῶν and ἀλεγεινῆς ἡμέρης. The concession of Parian land to the Thracians, its former owners, in exchange for their fighting the Naxians, was the accusation or, possibly, one of the accusations of Archilochus against Amphitimus. And the concession was made νηλεγέως, «without pity», obviously for the miserable Parian farmers. τόσους ... ἐξεχώρησεν γύας seems to have been the source of Demeas' ἰεργαφον δὲ τοσαῦτα (sc. χωρία) ἀντ[ι]άλλαγα.– νηλεγέως is recorded in Hsch. ν 470: νηλεγέως: ἀνοίκτως, i.e. «pitilessly», not «recklessly».

6-7 (59). ἀλλὰ θεῶν Ὀλυμπίων νόωι | νη[: Possibly, to be supplemented νηλεγέως in anaphora to the opening of line 6. If so, it must also refer to the land, taken back from the Thracians also without pity, only this time without pity for the Thracians. ? νηλεγέως ἅπαντας (sc. γύας) εἶλον, sc. the Parians. Why was this accomplished with the resolve of the Olympian

gods and not with Athena's aid as before? Apparently, because the Parians did not have to fight against the Thracians. The bloody task was carried out by the Naxians, as Demeas lets us know, no doubt getting the information from Archilochus' lost verses that followed line 6. In any case, it is clear that the poet ascribes the disasters of the Parians to Amphitimus, but the successful outcome of the battles to the gods, employing the timeless political trickery suitably described by Eteocles in Aesch. *Se.* 4 ff.:

εἰ μὲν γὰρ εὖ πράξαιμεν, αἰτία θεοῦ·
 εἰ δ' αὖθ', ὃ μὴ γένοιτο, συμφορὰ τύχοι,
 Ἐτεοκλέης ἄν εἷς πολὺς κατὰ πτόλιν
 ὕμνοϊθ' ὑπ' ἀστῶν φροϊμίοις πολυρρόθοις
 οἰμῶγμασίν θ'.

A tentative translation might be as follows:

(after) ... they delimited so large ones (to be given) in exchange, the Parians let the Thasians establish themselves there again. And he makes all these clear himself ..[.....].

«Who [could] guard the valley? [How] could you [prevent] the disaster? For, if you are now worrying about provisions for them, is this what we brought them for?» Sidestepping the issue of their violent and greedy behaviour said mama's boy Peisistratus' son. «It was men who shrink from the pipe and the lyre that I led by sea to Thasos, bribing with pure gold Thracian-born ones; and they, in their familiar way, out of rapacity, did general mischiefs.»

(Demeas relates) that, after they themselves slayed the Thracians, some of them were killed by the Parians and those (who fled) to Sapai by the Thracians. After that, Amphitimus becomes archon again. And in the following words he makes it clear again that they defeated forcefully the Naxians, speaking thus:

But Athena, the daughter of loud-sounding Zeus, standing propitiously by their battle, incited the heart of her own lamentable people. Passing these things over, though in the course of a painful day, he uttered other offensive reproaches. For so much land did he give up, all of it ruthlessly; but with the resolve of the Olympian gods ru[thlessly ...].

Let us, now, try to recapitulate, putting all pieces of information in order. At some uncertain time, after the Parians had driven away the Thracian inhabitants of Thasos and had settled there, Naxian settlers attempt to colonize Thasos appropriating the Parian territories in the process. In view of

this threat, the Parian archon, Amphitimus, son of Peisistratus, seeks the alliance of the former dwellers of Thasos, who now lived in the Thracian mainland. He promises to let them resettle in the island and grant them land in return for their services in fighting the Naxians. Amphitimus manages to convince them by lavishly bribing their leaders and brings them to Thasos. However, the Thracians, lacking provisions, ravaged the only source of food in the island, the fields and the flocks of the Parians. Therefore, Amphitimus, hastily and in the course of the battles, made the agreed concession of land to them. Both the ravaging and the taking away of their fields aroused a feeling of dejection among the Parians. Archilochus reproduces an angry dispute, no doubt in public, between himself and Amphitimus, in which the archon treated the poet with insolence and contempt regarding his poetic profession. The outcome was unexpected. The Thracians, who were supposed to fight the Naxians, were decimated by the latter; the Naxians were destroyed partly by the Parians, and those who fled to Sapai, in the continent, by the mainland Thracians. This may have been the inglorious end of the Naxian attempts to colonize Thrace. In consequence of all these, Amphitimus was nominated an archon for a second term.

It is interesting to observe that Demeas' historical report does not differ considerably from the above account, except in one point: it does not say anything about the wrangle between Archilochus and Amphitimus. The task of the chronicler, to place the poems of Archilochus in chronological order and extract historical information from them, is by no means unimportant. His method, however, was to extract purely historical information: dates (i.e. names of archons), treaties, battles. The information is given by the poet incidentally, since he is not composing a poetic chronicle. Yet, the dispute itself is not an event of importance for the historian. He investigatively exploits the poetic text, while his readers do not miss the literary merits of the source, since the verses will appear in his work as documentary evidence. On the other hand, it is pointless to speculate that Demeas narrated only one incident for each year and illustrated it with only one Archilochus fragment, and that Sosthenes' compendium followed the same principle. Actually, lines 40-3 introducing fr. 93a and the fragment itself deal exclusively with the Thracian incident. Are we to believe that the only event recorded in the first archonship of Amphitimus was the dispute between the archon and Archilochus? The Thracian incident is, however, only an episode in an extensive war. Is it possible that Demeas and Sosthenes documented the fact that the Thasians were hired by the Parians, but omitted to note what occasion they were hired on? I have no doubt whatsoever that, in the lines preceding 40, the inscription included a reference to the war against the

Naxians and, of course, to the first archonship of Amphitimus. Further, it is now clear that both fragments deal with the same dispute between Archilochus and Amphitimus, which must have taken place during the battles, after the Thracian incident but before the final outcome. The lost part of fr. 94 must have offered evidence regarding the later stages of the military operation and the second nomination of Amphitimus.

Marcaccini 191-5 compares the case of Cyrene, whose foundation and early colonial history is described at length by Herodotus, 4.147-67. I have no doubt that this must have been the situation in most Greek colonies. Successive waves of colonists must have followed the original settlers, whether invited or not, from the same metropolis or not, possibly causing conflicts with the first settlers or the local dwellers over the occupation of lands, the dispute being usually resolved either by war or peacefully, through redistribution of lands. But the specific case of the Parians of Thasos, as described by Archilochus, is uncommon, to say the least. The poet's fellow-citizens had to defend themselves both from the Greek enemy and the non-Greek ally; they had to fight the Naxian foes in order to protect their fields, which, however, their leader pitilessly offered to the Thracian mercenaries.

In both fragments, one sees that the bloody battles were actually fought for the seizure of fields and their crop. The fighting men are not valiant warriors, but poor farmers, who deserve to be pitied. Archilochus calls them here πολύκλαυτος λεώς; elsewhere he calls them ἄνολβος στρατός (fr. 88; cf. 112.3), laments their misfortunes (fr. 20 κλαίω τὰ Θασίων ... κακά) and calls their town thrice-wretched (fr. 228 Θάσον δὲ τὴν τρισοιζυρὴν πόλιν). His compatriots, together with the unlucky Naxians and, possibly, other colonists, form an all-Greek misery, the Πανελλήνων οἰζύς of fr. 102. The Parian archon himself pitilessly grants their fields to the Thracians. Nothing can be more painful for a farmer than to abandon his farm, especially in spring time, when the wheat, the barley, and the other plants, are shooting out their first sprouts.

One more designation employed by Archilochus for his citizens is the unusual epithet λιπερνῆτες (fr. 109):

ᾠ) λιπερνῆτες πολῖται, τὰμὰ δὴ συνίετε
 ῥήματα.

λιπερνῆς does not seem to be a vaguely descriptive epithet = «poor, forlorn, outcast», as it is interpreted in *LSJ*, though it may have been used so in later literature; e.g. λιπερνῆτις in Callim. fr. 254 Pf. Its components are too specific for so general a sense: «sproutless», like λιπότεχνος, «childless», or, rather, «sprout-abandoners», like λιποτάκτης, «deserter of one's rank». I be-

lieve that it reflects the situation described in this poem of Archilochus, and it may have been coined by him for that particular occasion. The grammatical evidence provides only some hints: Hsch. λ 1096 λιπέρνης (-ις cod.)· ὁ ἐκ πλουσίου πένης, ἢ ἐξ ἀγροῦ εἰς πόλιν πεφευγώς, ἢ ὁ λιπόπολις; *Et. Gen.* λ 117 Alp. λιπερνήτης καὶ λιπερνήτις θηλυκόν. σημαίνει δὲ ἡ λέξις τὸν ἐν-δεᾶ καὶ πτωχόν [...]. εἴρηται παρὰ τὸ λείπεσθαι ἐρνεῶν, ὃ ἐστὶ φυτῶν. κτλ. The connexion with fr. 93a and 94 is obvious. In the context of the battle of the Parians against the Naxians, the πολύκλαυτος λεώς is said to have withdrawn from so many fields which their archon granted to the Thracians: 94.5 τόσους γὰρ ἐξεχώρησεν γύας. Apparently they have withdrawn from the fields abandoning the cultivated plants still in sprout form, i.e. ἔρνεα λιπόντες. Or ἔρνεα may be used generally for «plants». In another trochaic fragment (fr. 89, from the Mnesiepes inscription), also describing a battle against the Naxians, probably the same one, we read 7 καὶ φυτῶν τομήν, 12 τέων ἀπέθρισαν (which need not be connected with fr. 222 ἵνας δὲ μεδέων ἀπέθρισεν; *aliter* West), and a verification of Hesychius' ἐξ ἀγροῦ εἰς πόλιν πεφευγώς, if the conflagration and the devastation in front of the town imply that the Parians have taken refuge to the city: 25 πῦρ ὃ δὴ νῦν ἀμφι[, 26 ἐν προαστίῳ κε[, 27 γῆν ἀεικίζουσιν¹⁸. Fr. 109 is very aptly adapted by Aristophanes in *Peace*, 603 f. ὦ σοφώτατοι γεωργοί, τὰμὰ δὴ ξυνίετε | ῥήματα¹⁹, as it vividly reflects the repeated experiences of the Attic farmers, represented by the chorus, besieged inside the walls, who every spring – this is the spring of 421 B.C. – saw their farms being devastated by the Peloponnesian forces²⁰.

However, apart from the common topic with fr. 93a and 94, the setting of fr. 109 seems also to be common. Archilochus is addressing his fellow-citizens, who were forced to abandon their sown fields, urging them to hear or pay heed to his own words. τὰμὰ δὴ ... ῥήματα suggests not only a public appearance of Archilochus, but also an altercation with another person: «listen to what *I* am to tell you», i.e. «do not listen to his words but to mine».

Another trochaic book fragment that might be connected with the situation described in fr. 93a and 94 is fr. 114, the big strategos fragment:

οὐ φιλέω μέγαν στρατηγὸν οὐδὲ διαπεπλιγμένον

18. Since it is a disaster of the Parians that is described, I would attribute the plants to them rather than to the Naxians, as is usually done.

19. The reading ὦ λιπερνήτες γεωργοί is attested in Diod. Sic. 12.40.6 and the historian Aristodemus, *FGrHist* 104 F 1 16 (line 278). Even if the reading of Aristophanes' tradition (ὦ σοφώτατοι) is accepted, the adjustment is obvious.

20. Even Tyrtaeus, 10.3 f., mentions the sad prospect of abandoning one's fields: τὴν δ' αὐτοῦ προλιπόντα πόλιν καὶ πίνοντα ἀγροῦς | πτωχεῦειν πάντων ἔστ' ἀνηρότατον.

οὐδὲ βοστρύχοισι γαῦρον οὐδ' ὑπεξυρημένον,
 ἀλλὰ μοι σμικρὸς τις εἶη καὶ περὶ κνήμας ἰδεῖν
 ῥοϊκός, ἀσφαλέως βεβηκῶς ποσσί, καρδίης πλέως.

We mentioned the fragment above as evidence of Archilochus' critical stance towards the Parian leadership. We also claimed that the verses are not a generalizing gnome expressing Archilochus' view of the ideal military commander, but a personal criticism of a specific individual, as is shown by the impressionistic description of distinctive features. The first person speech may or may not imply a dialogue or a discourse delivered before an audience. But the criticism is definitely made in the context of a military operation, since the specific general does not seem to have been ἀσφαλέως βεβηκῶς ποσσί, used, most likely, figuratively for «stand fast» or «stand his ground». Further, this being the first occurrence of the term στρατηγός, we should keep in mind that Archilochus is not speaking of an officer holding a professional rank or a grade in the armed forces, but merely of the city's magistrate, who, being elected by the nobility to exercise common governmental powers, assumed, on the present occasion, responsibility of the military operations. Might he be Amphitimus? One cannot say. Fr. 93a and 94 criticize his acts but do not describe him. Unless μητρίπαις might be considered such a description. If the compound implies delicacy and effeminacy, not only the ostentatious display of his curls might be explained, but, possibly, a different interpretation might also be given to ὑπεξυρημένον: not «partly shaven» but «shaven underneath», i.e. «with shaven legs». This is how Dio Chrysostomus, 33.17, seems to understand the participle, since his description of the short general contains *κάπι κνήμαισιν δασύς*, | *ῥοϊκός*, in place of the generally accepted Galenus version *καὶ περὶ κνήμας ἰδεῖν* | *ῥοϊκός*. Much later, Lucian, *Salt*. 5.22, discriminates manly characteristics from effeminate ones: *ἔστ' ἂν δασύς εἶην τὰ σκέλη καὶ τὸ γένειον ἀπαράτιλτος*²¹. Of course, the characteristics of the big strategos might fit as well other persons of the Thasian community. Of such persons known to us from Archilochus, Glaucus is not a son of Peisistratus and is, probably, a companion of the poet, whereas Leophilus (fr. 115), though severely satirized, is not described in military terms²².

If the altercation between Archilochus and Amphitimus is made, as I claim, in public, fr. 125,

21. M. Z. Kopidakis, *Ἑλληνικά* 29 (1976) 344-5, who, however, matches ὑπεξυρημένος with Lucian's τὸ γένειον ἀπαράτιλτος.

22. West, *Studies* 130, identifies the strategos of fr. 114 with Leophilus and, therefore, places the polyptoton right after it. Leophilus is criticized as an authoritative archon; see *Κτερίσματα* (above n. 1).

— υ — μάχης δὲ τῆς σῆς, ὥστε διψέων πιεῖν,
ὦς ἐρέω,

may represent the poet's eager wish, not for an erotic or a military battle, as it is usually interpreted, but for the wrangle with the archon we have seen above.

Fr. 127,

ἤμβλακον. καί πού τιν' ἄλλον ἦδ' ἴατη ἰκίησατο,

may also represent the closing of Amphitimus' words, who is possibly admitting his error with regard to the treaty with the Thracians; cf. *Il.* 9.116 ἀασάμην, οὐδ' αὐτὸς ἀναίνομαι, which Clement considers as Archilochus' source; it is Agamemnon who admits his error there, answering Nestor. I cannot imagine Archilochus admitting an error.

Even Archilochus' proud first-person declarations of his musical competence in fr. 120,

ὡς Διωνύσου ἄνακτος καλὸν ἐξάρξαι μέλος
οἶδα διθύραμβον οἴνωι συγκεραυνωθεὶς φρένας,

and fr. 121,

αὐτὸς ἐξάρχων πρὸς αὐλὸν Λέσβιον παιήονα,

may possibly respond to Amphitimus' reproaches. He is not a petty entertainer; he is a dignified leader in religious choral performances, such as Dionysus' dithyramb and Apollo's paean.

Manifest is also Archilochus' aversion toward the Thracian mercenaries. This attitude combined with his vigorous personal interest for his fellow-citizens makes the widespread claim that the poet was himself employed as a mercenary (to whom?) very questionable²³. I believe that the theory depends on mere misinterpretation of a number of fragments. First of all, we should have expected that Critias (88 B 44 D.-K., from *Ael. VH* 10.13; *Archil. fr.* 295), had he found a reference to it, would have blamed the poet for revealing in his poems such an activity. We spoke above about the significance of fr. 1. It is less likely that Archilochus is proudly declaring his double profession of warrior and poet, as that he is seeking to remove the blame that the two activities are incompatible. Elsewhere he is more plain-spoken. His negative stance toward mercenaries is well known from the hexametric fr. 15, convincingly attributed to the Parian by Bergk. The poet is ad-

23. For instance, H. W. Parke, *Greek Mercenary Soldiers*, Oxford 1933, p. 4; at p. 227 he includes Archilochus in the number of mercenaries «who adopted their profession because of political exile or like cause». H. D. Rankin, *Archilochus of Paros*, Park Ridge, N.J. 1977, pp. 15-16, 81, equates the capacities of a colonist and a mercenary.

vising his companion never to trust mercenaries beyond their fighting duties:

Γλαῦκ', ἐπίκουρος ἀνὴρ τόσσον φίλος ἔσκε μάχῃται.

Fr. 216,

καὶ δὴ 'πίκουρος ὥστε Κὰρ κεκλήσομαι,

has often been invoked to witness Archilochus' mercenary status, but it actually attests the opposite. Carians, typical mercenaries in Greek armies, were usually employed as front line fighters, running all the risks of the battle. Whence, the proverb ἐν τῶι Καρὶ κινδυνεύειν was used in the sense «to venture upon something at others' peril», «to run a risk vicariously». Precisely this comparison with the Carian mercenaries and the future perfect κεκλήσομαι show clearly that Archilochus is referring to a battle act, which was so venturesome that his involvement in it would equate him with a Carian mercenary. Since the context is missing, we cannot know whether the poet actually performed the act he is speaking of or whether he was merely explaining why he was refusing to perform it. West, *ZPE* 61 (1985), 13, supported the mercenary theory claiming that in fr. 98 from the Sosthenes inscription, the poet sides with the defenders employing the first person plural, whereas in line 8 of the same fragment, where there is mention of the fighters' fatherland, he speaks of them in the third person plural: A IV 8,

ἀμφ[ι] δ' ὑψ[η]λὰς ἐπάλλξεις ἤρ]κεσαν πρὸ π[α]τρίη[ς]²⁴,

«around high battlements they defended *their* homeland». I do not fully understand the image of the fighters defending their homeland *around* high battlements. In any case, it is the defences themselves that frequently serve as subject of ἀρκέω. E.g.,

ἀμφ[ι] δ' ὑψ[η]λὰ προβλήματ' ἤρ]κεσαν πρὸ π[α]τρίη[ς],
 χρῆμ' [ὑπερφυές,

«high bulwarks all around (ἀμφί adverb) defended *our* homeland, an enormous work». Another argument for Archilochus' supposed mercenariness is fr. 22 from Ath. 523d καὶ Ἀρχίλοχος δὲ ὁ ποιητῆς ὑπερτεθαύμακε τὴν χώραν τῶν Σιριτῶν διὰ τὴν εὐδαιμονίαν. περὶ γοῦν τῆς Θάσου λέγων ὡς ἦσσονός φησιν·

οὐ γάρ τι καλὸς χῶρος οὐδ' ἐρίμερος
 οὐδ' ἐρατός, οἷος ἀμφὶ Σίριος ῥοάς.

The river Siris is in Southern Italy flowing into the gulf of Taranto. How else could Archilochus know this faraway place, if not from a mercenary service?

24. ὑψ[η]λὰς ἐπάλλξεις West, ἤρ]κεσαν Maas, π[α]τρίη[ς] Peek.

Parians are not known to have founded or attempted to found a colony there. The city of the same name that was situated at the river's mouth is, in the legend, a Trojan colony, but, in historical times, it was known as a colony of Colophon²⁵. However, it is very likely that Athenaeus was wrong. F. Jacobs had proposed that Archilochus must compare Thasos, not with the distant South Italian Siris, but with a neighbouring fertile valley, which must have been the valley of Strymon, in the mainland opposite Thasos, where a town named Σῆρις (now Serres) was located²⁶. The problem is that the river is named Στρυμών (so already in Hes. *Th.* 339), not Σῆρις, and Archilochus mentions ἀμφὶ Σίριος ῥοάς²⁷. It seems, however, that Σῆρις was a typical Mediterranean (?) name of rivers. Apart from the South Italian Siris, so was named the Southern part of Nile from its sources to Aswan (Dion. Perieg. 223 f. Σῆρις ὑπ' Αἰθιοπῶν κικλήσκειται· οἱ δὲ Συήνης | ἐνναέται στρεφθέντα μετ' οὐνομα Νεῖλον ἔθεντο; add Eustathius' commentary ad loc.), as well as a river in Libya (Steph. Byz. s. Φασηλοῦσσα· δύο νῆσοι Λιβύης πλησίον Σίριος ποταμοῦ. Ἐκαταῖος Περιηγήσει Λιβύης (*FGrHist* 1 F 353)), unless the Upper Nile is meant here too. Comparable is Ὑοσιρις, the mystic name of Nile (Eudox. fr. 294 = Plut. 364 a 8 οἱ δὲ σοφώτεροι τῶν ἱερέων ... τὸν Νεῖλον Ὑοσιριν καλοῦσι; cf. Hld. *Aeth.* 9.9.4), and Σῆρις, name of a Nereid (*EM* 714.11, Sch. in Lyc. 856).

One cannot say if the episode of the killing of the Thracian Oisydres by the Parians and the claim of blood-money by the Thracian tribe of Bisaltai (Callim. fr. 104 Pf., Archil. fr. 92 W.; cf. fr. 91.7) must also be introduced in the vicinity of fr. 93a and 94. The story may belong to the context of these hostilities, but how close its association is with the particular episode described in this poem remains doubtful.

To sum up, I believe that the new reading of a part of the Sosthenes inscription does not merely integrate two incomplete Archilochus fragments, but also casts some new light on the history of the Greek colonization, the conflicts between the colonists, their connexions with the local dwellers, and similar issues; it also elucidates the mutual antipathy between Archilochus and the Parian leadership: the poet takes sides with his miserable fellow-citizens accusing the leaders of imprudent acts, while the leaders treat him with contempt and scorn, precisely for his poetic profession.

Aristotle University of Thessaloniki

K. TSANTSANOGLOU

25. A curious claim is laid upon the city by Themistocles, Hdt. 8.62, perhaps alluding to Athens not as direct metropolis of Siris, but as leader of the Ionians who founded it.

26. *Animadversiones in epigrammata Anthologiae Graecae* I 1, Lipsiae 1798, p. 166.

27. F. Bossi, *RFIC* 103 (1975) 130; Marcaccini, *ib.*, 157 n. 24.