

## A Soldier's Destiny: Archilochus Fr. 2 W.

Carlo Santaniello

### 1. Different translations

Fr. 2 D.=2 T.=2 W. has always elicited warm interest from Archilochus' readers. The suggestive triple anaphora ἐν δορὶ effectively underlines the former of the two identities — the soldier and the poet — claimed for by the poet in fr. 1 W.<sup>1</sup>. Besides, fr. 2 — which like several other alleged fragments might be a complete poem, instead<sup>2</sup> — highlights another essential feature of Archilochus' character: his calm awareness of his own solitude — which is very far from implying any decadent feeling of desolation. So, it is no chance that fr. 2 is one of the relics of our poet's verse which best exemplify his enduring influence — in fact, fr. 2 has been preserved by late authors like Athenaeus of Naucratis (ii-iii c. A.D.) and Synesius of Cyrene (iv-v c. A.D.). Here is the text from M. L. West's *Iambi et elegi*:

ἐν δορὶ μὲν μοι μάζα μεμαγμένη, ἐν δορὶ δ' οἶνος  
ἴσμαρικός· πίνω δ' ἐν δορὶ κεκλιμένος<sup>3</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> On fr. 1 cp. Broccia 2005. Apart from fr. 2, anaphora occurs in Archil. fr. 26. 5-6; 115; 128. 1; 130. 1-3. — If it is not indicated otherwise, all Archilochean fragments are quoted from West 1989, and all translations are mine. Abbreviations of ancient authors and works are as shown in *OCD*, pp. xxvii-liii. I wish to express my thanks to G. W. Most for his careful reading and criticism of an earlier version. Of course, all responsibility for the ideas stated in this paper is mine. I am also grateful to P. Corrêa for sending me a copy of the new edition of her *Armas e Varões*; and to A. Boegehold and X. Riu for sending me copies of their papers from Katsonopoulou – Petropoulos – Katsarou 2008.

<sup>2</sup> This opinion is upheld by Felson 1981, p. 7, and Boegehold 2008, p. 183. See also fr. 1, 5, 128, and, above all, 13 («fortasse carmen integrum», as West remarks in the apparatus).

<sup>3</sup> No *variae lectiones* worth of mention in the three sources which preserve fr. 2 (Ath. 1. 30f; Synes. *epist.* 129b; Suda s. vv. ὑπνομαχῶ et ἴσμαρικός οἶνος) are recorded in the editions by Tarditi and West.

The powerful charm emanating from the self-description offered in fr. 2 has been for centuries associated with the hammering reference to the soldier's favourite weapon, the spear, with which everybody seems to have constantly identified the δόρυ till half a century ago. For instance, leaving apart the ancient authors (I will deal with Hybrias of Crete and Synesius of Cyrene later), let me take the Latin translation by Petavius for his 1612 edition of Synesius (1633<sup>2</sup>), which is quoted by I. Liebel in his interesting edition of Archilochus (1818<sup>2</sup>):

*Maza mihi hastato praebetur, Bacchus in hasta  
Ismaricus; dum me sustinet hasta, bibo*<sup>4</sup>;

or the English translation by J. M. Edmonds (1931):

In the spear is my kneaded bread, in the spear  
My Ismarian wine, when I drink I recline on the spear<sup>5</sup>;

or the German by H. Fränkel (1951):

Meine Lanze bäckt mir mein Brot, die Lanze verzapft mir  
Ismarer Wein, sie gibt, während ich trinke, mir Halt<sup>6</sup>.

or the French by A. Bonnard (1958):

De ma lance dépend ma ration de pain d'orge, de ma lance mon vin  
d'Ismaros; et je le bois, appuyé sur ma lance<sup>7</sup>.

Since the first half of last century, however, some scholars (B. A. van Groningen, J. A. Davison, C. M. Bowra, V. Ehrenberg) began to question the commonly accepted way of understanding the fragment, mainly on stylistical and syntactical grounds.

As to the stylistical grounds, it was lamented that the 'traditional' translation — which understands δόρυ as "spear" and assumes that κεκλιμένος governs ἐν δορὶ signifying "as I lean on my spear" — is wrong because ἐν δορὶ could never mean "at my spear" or "by my

---

<sup>4</sup> Liebel 1818, p. 160. This translation can also be read in *PG* 66, col. 1514. Cp. Dalechamps' translation in Casaubon 1667, p. 30: *Hasta maza subacta mihi est vinumque paratum/Ismaricum: hasta nos nitimur et bibimus.*

<sup>5</sup> Edmonds 1931, II, p. 99.

<sup>6</sup> I am quoting from the fourth edition (1993, p. 152).

<sup>7</sup> Lasserre – Bonnard 1958, p. 3.

spear” twice and something different (“as I lean *on* my spear”) the third time<sup>8</sup>.

With regard to the syntactical grounds, it was pointed out that *κεκλίσθαι* commands the simple dative or is variously constructed with either *εἰς* or *ἐπί* or *πρός*, in order to signify “to lean on”, and not with *ἐν*, unless in order to mean “to lie on”<sup>9</sup>.

At this stage of the debate the scholars who tried to give a new interpretation to the fragment often retained something of the traditional one, but, of course, there was some new suggestion. Davison in his 1960 paper — a very short one, but very clever at showing the weak points of every theory — started by declaring his acceptance of the postulate proclaimed by van Groningen and Bowra that *ἐν δορὶ* should keep the same meaning in all three occurrences; then he took into account Bowra’s theory that *ἐν δορὶ* was to be understood as “equipped with a spear”, therefore metaphorically as “on active service”, only to refute it immediately afterwards, because one cannot lie down ... “on active service”. At this point, Davison offered another explanation — *ἐν δορὶ* as “in my ship” — which he had already put forward in a preceding contribution<sup>10</sup>. According to Davison, this solution, as the only one really satisfying the dogma that *ἐν δορὶ* should keep the same meaning on all three occurrences, was the right one, although no example of *δόρυ* employed in the sense of “ship” is known earlier than Aesch. *Pers.* 411 (it sounds very unlikely that, as suggested by Davison, *τέκτονα δούρων*, *Od.* 17. 384, might mean “shipwright”)<sup>11</sup>.

## 2. Gentili’s theory and some critical remarks

Davison’s contribution opened the way to Gentili’s richer analysis, which was to obtain a broad consensus, notwithstanding the firm resistance put up by some on many grounds, and more and more often

---

<sup>8</sup> Van Groningen 1930, pp. 75-76; Bowra 1970, pp. 67-8 (but the first version of this paper dates back to 1954); Davison 1960, p. 1; Ehrenberg 1962, p. 239.

<sup>9</sup> Van Groningen 1930, pp. 75 and 78; Bowra 1970, p. 68; Davison 1960, p. 1, who also referred to Hudson-Williams 1926; cp. Ehrenberg 1962, who supported the opinion of the foregoing scholars, but could not hide his doubts.

<sup>10</sup> Bowra 1970, p. 69 (he actually proposed “under arms” or “at my post”); Davison 1954 and 1960, pp. 2-3.

<sup>11</sup> Davison 1960, p. 3. See below, n. 31, for the passage from Aeschylus. As to Homer, note that *Od.* 9. 126 has *νηῶν... τέκτονας* for “shipwrights”.

till these last years. The Italian scholar examined the arguments brought forward by others, some he accepted or refuted, and some he tried to improve, by going over the matter three times, in 1965, 1970, and 1976<sup>12</sup>. Here is the translation offered by Gentili, who understood ἐν δόρῳ as “sul legno” (i. e. “on the planks of the ship’s deck”):

Sul legno è il mio pane impastato, e qui sul legno il mio vino d’Ismaro, sul legno sdraiato io bevo<sup>13</sup>.

So, Archilochus would be eating and drinking while lying on a ship’s deck.

Let me summarize Gentili’s scrutiny and add my counterarguments:

— a. Gentili called attention to the fact that two kinds of spears existed: one heavier, the ἔγχος, made for short-distance fight, i. e. for thrusting, and the δόρυ, made for long-distance fight, i. e. for throwing. He acknowledged that in Homer the word δόρυ could be used for ἔγχος sometimes, but denied that the same applied to Archilochus and to lyric poets in general. Therefore, Archilochus’ δόρυ would be the spear apt to be thrown, too light to bear the weight of a body leaning on it<sup>14</sup>.

Counterarguments: First of all, I wish to focus on fr. 3. 5, a much discussed passage, because our poet praises the excellence of Euboeans in sword-fighting, but soon after he calls them “famous for spear-fighting”, δουρικλυτοί. R. Renehan<sup>15</sup> explained that the fragment is based on the opposition «between swords and spears together on the one hand and arrows and slings on the other». He also recalled that Hom. *Il.* 2. 543 confirms that Abantes, a people from Euboea, were wont to break the enemies’ breast armour ὀρεκτῆσιν μελίησι. On my part, I can add that these words are translated “(with) pikes to be used for thrusting” by L.–S.–J., s.v. ὀρεκτός, which confirms that the δόρυ used by Euboeans was a heavy thrusting-spear<sup>16</sup>. Therefore, such a

---

<sup>12</sup> See also Gentili – Catenacci 2007, pp. 85-87.

<sup>13</sup> Gentili 1965, p. 134.

<sup>14</sup> Gentili 1970, pp. 115-117. On his part, Davison 1960, p. 1 thought that the shaft of a spear was too long and too smooth to act as a prop.

<sup>15</sup> Renehan 1983, pp. 1-2.

<sup>16</sup> On the Abantes see also Lavelle 2008, pp. 155-156 n. 14.

weapon was to be found in the immediate environment of Archilochus and was well-known to him.

Secondly, the fact cannot easily be disregarded that a sculpture like the *Athéna mélancolique*, leaning on a spear, and endless manly figures leaning on a spear or on a staff, painted on archaic or classical age vases, represent what seems to be even a commonplace of Greek art, although from a period later than Archilochus' age<sup>17</sup>. As far as Homer is concerned, D. E. Gerber quoted *Il.* 22. 225 (Achilles leaning on his spear), an example which was later taken up by A. Treloar, who added *Il.* 8. 496 (indicated as 8. 38 by mistake; Hektor in the same attitude as Achilles) and 19. 49 (Diomedes and Odysseus, both wounded, who walk while supporting themselves on their spears)<sup>18</sup>. It is also striking that in the last passage mentioned Diomedes and Odysseus are described as Ἄρεος θεράποντες — clearly a precedent of the θεράπων...Ἐνυαλίῳ ἄνακτος of Archil. fr. 1<sup>19</sup>.

Both those references to sculpture and vase-painting and these quotations from Homer seem to me impossible to disprove or to ignore.

— b. Gentili maintained that κλίνω or κλίνομαι (in the sense, transitive or intransitive, of “leaning”) cannot be constructed with ἐν and the dative, but only with the simple dative or πρὸς and the accusative (see already Hudson-Williams, van Groningen, Bowra, Davison, Ehrenberg). In order to support this thesis, Gentili quoted Hom. *Il.* 3. 135, ἀσπίσι κεκλιμένοι, and even Archilochus himself, fr. 36, πρὸς τοῖχον ἐκλίνθησαν ἐν παλινσκίῳ<sup>20</sup>.

Counterarguments: This is certainly the most interesting of the arguments brought forward by Gentili and his forerunners. Relying on Page's important paper on Archilochus and the oral tradition, Gentili thought that Archilochus generally avoided innovating in Homeric

<sup>17</sup> This *topos* was conveniently recalled by Ehrenberg 1962, p. 239: «Archilochus was resting and relaxing, and it may be not quite irrelevant to point out that Greeks had a favourite way of relaxing while standing, by leaning on their staff or spear». Ehrenberg's remark was confirmed by Sulliger 1962, p. 34, and Rankin 1972, p. 472. On the meaning of the *Athéna Mélancolique* see Chamoux 1957.

<sup>18</sup> Gerber 1970, p. 13; Treloar 1979, p. 34 and n. 9.

<sup>19</sup> Cp. Hom. *Il.* 2. 110, where all the Danai are called θεράποντες Ἄρεος. About the connection of Archilochus' words with the Hesiodic corpus see Lavelle 2008, p. 153.

<sup>20</sup> Gentili 1965, p. 130; 1970, pp. 117-120. If the text of fr. 36 has been correctly emended (cp. below), it could be translated: “They leant against the wall in the thick shade”.

morphology and syntax. Now, to say the truth, Page spoke of «traditional phrasing», which may not be exactly the same thing<sup>21</sup>. By the way, Archilochus innovated in Homeric morphology just in fr. 2, as the locution ἐν δορὶ shows no lengthening for compensation of the digamma which originally followed the omicron<sup>22</sup>. And what about syntax?

E. Merone mentioned two instances in which Archilochus shifts from Homeric use of the dative: one is the construction of κλίνομαι with ἐν and the dative in the fragment I am dealing with; the other is the construction of ἀσχαλάω with the dative in fr. 128. 6 (κακοῖσιν ἀσχάλα) instead of the genitive as in Homer<sup>23</sup>. In addition, I wish to bring forward a third instance: fr. 13. 2 θαλίης τέρπεται, which can be compared not only with *Od.* 11. 603 τέρπεται ἐν θαλίης, but also with *Il.* 9. 705-706 (τεταρπόμενοι φίλον ἦτορ/σίτου καὶ οἴνοιο) and 11. 780 (τάρπημεν ἐδητύος ἠδὲ ποτήτος). So one can be sure that, at least now and then, Archilochus indeed innovates in Homer's syntax, and specifically in the use of the dative case.

But let us go back to the construction of κλίνομαι with ἐν and the dative. F. Ferrari<sup>24</sup> rightly pointed to the fact that the compound verb ἐγκλίνομαι is sometimes used with the dative. Two passages clearly exemplify the powerfully metaphorical suggestion of the act of leaning on something or on somebody:

- Plut. *Cam.* 22. 5 describes the quiet force of the old senators, who do not stir at all at the sight of Brennus' warriors raiding the Curia: they remain sitting ἐγκεκλιμένοι τοῖς σκίπωσιν, «leaning on their sceptres», the sticks symbolizing their authority — an attitude showing that, notwithstanding the danger, they are still in full command;
- Xen. *Smp.* 3. 13 stages Autolykos declaring that he prides himself on his father Lycon, and, as he says so, «leaning on him» (καὶ ἄμα

<sup>21</sup> Gentili 1976, p. 19; Page 1964, pp. 126-127.

<sup>22</sup> This was explained very well by Pavese 1995, p. 335, who rightly concluded: «L'espressione ἐν δορὶ dunque fu attinta da Archiloco non dal proprio dialetto né dall'epica omerica, ma da una tradizione attica, euboica e più generalmente continentale»; on this see already Scherer 1964, p. 92.

<sup>23</sup> Merone 1960, pp. 48-49. He quoted Hom. *Od.* 19. 159 (ἀσχαλάα δὲ πάϊς βίοντον κατεδόντων); for an example where the noun declined at the genitive concerns a thing see *ibid.* l. 534: κτήσιος ἀσχαλῶν, τὴν οἱ κατέδουσιν Ἀχαιοί.

<sup>24</sup> See Ferrari 2000, pp. 145-146; as to the translation, cp. already Ferrari 1995, I, p. 277.

ἐνεκλίθη ἀντῶ): here the leaning attitude expresses the feeling of confidence in the beloved father.

These two passages portray the calm assurance of men who figuratively “lean” on their own power represented by the sceptres or physically lean on somebody they trust. But the verb ἐγκλίνεσθαι, or better, inflected into perfect, ἐγκεκλίσθαι, can also refer to a responsibility metaphorically resting on somebody. This is the case with another passage quoted by Ferrari, which takes us chronologically nearer to Archilochus:

– Hom. *Il.* 6. 77-78: πόνος ὕμμι μάλιστα/Τρώων καὶ Λυκίων ἐγκεκλίται. Here Helenus, son of Priamus, is admonishing Aeneas and Hektor: «The responsibility for leading the hard war waged by Trojans and Lycians (against the Greeks) rests mainly upon your shoulders».

True, Xenophon and Plutarch are no poets but prose writers, and very remote from our poet’s time. The example from Homer sounds more encouraging, anyway. Did Archilochus use κλίνομαι with ἐν and the dative instead of ἐγκλίνομαι and the dative? Why not, if he did innovate in Homer’s syntax, as I have shown? As a matter of fact, already G. Perrotta (whose opinion was reported and shared by Tarditi) maintained that ἐν δορὶ κεκλιμένος should be understood as δορὶ ἐγκεκλιμένος: *in hastam reclinatus*<sup>25</sup>.

As to fr. 36, which was referred to by Gentili as said above, the mss. of Harpocration’s lexicon, the source which has preserved it (other lexicographers copied from Harpocration, according to West), read ἐκινήθησαν, which was corrected into ἐκλίνθησαν by J. Toup. This emendation, accepted by both Tarditi and West, may well be right, but, in my opinion, “leaning against” (a wall) cannot be regarded as equivalent to “leaning on” (a spear). So, I think that also this argument should be refuted.

---

<sup>25</sup> See Tarditi 1968, p. 60. One could even see ἐν δορὶ κεκλιμένος as a tmesis for δορὶ ἐγκεκλιμένος, but the examples known to me (fr. 3. 1; 13. 6; 177. 2 and 196a. 12) suggest that this rhetorical figure should be recognized in Archilochus only when a preverb cannot at all be understood as a preposition which governs the following noun. Anyway, I see that Montgomery 1990, p. 275 thought that there was tmesis in fr. 2.

— c. Gentili thought that each occurrence of a syntagm in an anaphorical series should keep the same meaning<sup>26</sup>.

Counterarguments: Apparently, this argument was highly considered by Gentili and many of his forerunners (van Groningen, Bowra, and others); if it were true, it would be really impossible for ἐν δορὶ to refer to the spear owing to the change in the syntax. But I very much doubt that an identical meaning in all members of an anaphora could be regarded as an absolutely necessary requirement. In some cases, at least, rather the contrary is to be expected, as anaphora is a “verbal figure” (σχῆμα λέξεως), not a “thought figure” (σχῆμα διανοίας)<sup>27</sup>.

Of course, the theory that the anaphora should require absolute identity of meaning in all occurrences of the same words was denied by some scholars long ago: already in 1967 did D. A. Campbell refute it, while commenting on our fragment; he also thought that he had found a parallel in Sapph. c. 1. 15-17, where ὅττι is used twice in the sense of “what” and once as “why”<sup>28</sup>.

The question of the anaphora was dealt with from a semiologic point of view by N. Felson Rubin in 1981. She very aptly reacted to the dogma of the “consistent signified” (i.e. the supposed rule that the same word or locution should keep the same meaning throughout the anaphora); she expressly contradicted Gentili’s position that the anaphora would lose its function if there was any change in the meaning of the words repeated; and she pointed out very well that «the efficacy of the anaphora lies in the *deliberate* semantic shift, of which this [i.e. Archil. fr. 2] is certainly an early example». She calls it «a repetition of the signifier with a different signified»<sup>29</sup>.

But, in my opinion, nobody described the use of anaphora in our fragment any more sharply than G. Paduano, who wrote some years later than Felson: «Non ci si limita a scandire con l’anafora tre

<sup>26</sup> Gentili 1965, p. 134.

<sup>27</sup> Cp. Quint. 9. 1.33.

<sup>28</sup> Campbell 1967, p. 142. This is Sappho’s text and translation from Campbell (1990<sup>2</sup>, pp. 54-55): ἦρε ὅττι δηῖτε πέπονθα κῶττι/ δηῖτε κάλημι,/ κῶττι μοι μάλιστα θέλω γένεσθαι/ μαινόλα θυμῶ — “you asked *what* was the matter with me this time and *why* I was calling this time and *what* in my maddened heart I most wished to happen for myself” (italics are mine). I am not sure that the passage from Sappho can be compared with Archil. fr. 2; I prefer the argument brought forward by N. Felson Rubin (see immediately below).

<sup>29</sup> Felson Rubin 1981, p. 6. For the semantic shift in the anaphora cp. Rankin 1972, pp. 473-474, and Burnett 1983, p. 38 n. 15.



affermazioni che stabiliscono il rapporto dell'uomo con la vita militare, ma contemporaneamente si fa slittare il termine “lancia” da un uso traslato (di sineddoche, di antonomasia, per cui l'arma rappresenta tutto l'universo delle cose e situazioni pertinenti al soldato) a un uso proprio, tracciando l'immagine plastica dell'uomo che la usa come sostegno materiale»<sup>30</sup>.

— d. For all the reasons expounded under a., b., and c. (reasons which I think to have disproved) Gentili thought that ἐν δορῖ should be understood neither as “at the spear” or “on the spear”. Nor did he accept the translation “in the ship”, proposed by Davison, because no occurrence of δόρυ in this sense is known earlier than the beginning of the fifth century<sup>31</sup>. With great confidence this scholar proposed to understand ἐν δορῖ according to «il suo primo significato di legno, ovvero di legno, tavola, trave della nave secondo il normale uso omerico di δόρυ νῆϊον»<sup>32</sup>. But how does it come that a word which is employed in so many senses could be used as “plank”, part of the deck of a ship, without the adjective νῆϊον, which offers the only means for the poet to make himself understood? Gentili thought that he could answer this question by imagining that fr. 2 and 4 were relics of one and the same poem: first (fr. 4), Archilochus would show little interest for the meal and ask for wine to be poured out of casks and given out to him and his companions; then (fr. 2), he would remark that he was having his emergency ration (the μᾶζα) and he was drinking his extraordinary wine *while lying on the deck*<sup>33</sup>.

Counterarguments: First of all, it is unlikely that fr. 4 and 2 were part of the same poem<sup>34</sup>: if it were so, the singular ἐμοῖ (fr. 4. 5) would

<sup>30</sup> Paduano 1990, p. 390.

<sup>31</sup> Davison 1960, p. 3 indicated Aesch. *Pers.* 411 as the first occurrence of δόρυ in the sense of “ship”; Gentili 1965, p. 131 pointed to Bacchyl. 17. 90, and Arnould 1980, p. 287 n. 31 added Simon. fr. 543. 10 Page. None of these scholars took notice that the meaning “ship” is made clear by the fact that ναῦς (in Aeschylus) or νᾶα (in Bacchylides) is to be read in the foregoing line. And, of course, the word δοῦρατι could well indicate a “chest” in Simonides: Paduano 1990, p. 541 translates “cassa”.

<sup>32</sup> Gentili 1965, p. 133, who quotes Hom. *Il.* 15. 410 and *Od.* 9. 498 as examples of this usage of δόρυ.

<sup>33</sup> Gentili 1965, 133-134.

<sup>34</sup> Find here below the (very lacunose) text of fr. 4:

⊗ φρα[  
    ξειναι. [  
    δειπνον δ'ου[

be followed by the plural ἡμεῖς (fr. 4. 8), and this, again, by the singular forms μοι, πίνω, κεκλιμένος (fr. 2); besides, the audience is different: Archilochus' companions in fr. 4, and an indefinite public in fr. 2 (otherwise, our poet would be telling his companions that he is eating and drinking — which would be pointless, as they already see him doing so). I find these two remarks even in a paper written by one who shares Gentili's thesis as P. Giannini<sup>35</sup>.

But there is more. As far as we know, δόρυ is used by Archilochus only in the sense of “spear”; apart from the fragment in question, δόρυ occurs in fr. 98. 5, where, in spite of the many lacunae, the context suggests the meaning “spears”<sup>36</sup>; δόρυ is also part of the compound δουρικλυτοί, “famous for spear-fighting” (fr. 3. 5), on which I have already dwelt.

— e. Not too much is to be gathered from the context in Ath. 1. 30f and from the passages of the Suda which have preserved fr. 2. But a parallel to the situation described by Archilochus is offered by Synes. *epist.* 129b (=130 Hercher), the main witness of the distich, together with Athenaeus. Surprisingly enough, Synesius' tale seemed to Gentili, and

---

οὔτ' ἔμοι ὠσαῖ[	15
ἀλλ' ἄγε σὺν κώ[θωνι θοῆς διὰ σέλματα νηὸς	
φοῖτα καὶ κοίλων πώματ' ἀφελκε κάδων,	
ἄγρει δ' οἶνον [έρυθρον ἀπὸ τρυγός· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἡμεῖς	
νηφέμεν [έν φυλακῇ τῆδε δυνησόμεθα.	

“?”

... guests

But no meal

...nor to me as...

5

But come many times with the drinking-vessel among the benches

Of the swift ship, and pull off the covers of the hollow barrels,

And draw the red wine from the lees; we will not be able

To remain sober on this watch”.

<sup>35</sup> Giannini 1988, pp. 43-44. Also Lasserre 1979, p. 51 doubted the connection between fr. 4 and fr. 2. Lennartz 2010, p. 457 n. 1642 — by the way, a supporter of the spear theory — refuted such connection outright. Aloni 1981, p. 49 shared Gentili's (and Bossi's, 1980 and 1990<sup>2</sup>, pp. 70-71) belief that fr. 2 belonged to the same poem as fr. 4; cp. Nikolaev 2014, p. 22 n. 52. — As to fr. 4, I wish to add that a *coronis* is to be read before l. 2 in the papyrus and, on his part, Athenaeus seems to have preserved an even longer text than required by his purpose, probably reporting the elegy up to the end, which would rule out the possibility that fr. 2 followed.

<sup>36</sup> See the text, apparatus and translation in Ornaghi 2009, pp. 57-60.

to some at least of the supporters of his interpretation, to offer a clear analogy to the the supposed meal and drink on the ship's deck in fr. 2<sup>37</sup>. Counterarguments: This feature of Gentili's theory is hardly acceptable anyway, no matter how one understands Archilochus' couplet. Synesius explains very clearly that he is writing as he is on duty inside the walls of besieged Cyrene (τειχίρης γάρ εἶμι καὶ πολιορκούμενος γράφω); and that he is stationed under the wall between two towers (ἐγὼ δὲ ὑπὸ μεσοπυργίῳ τεταγμένος ὑπνομαχῶ). These indications have been rightly used by A. Nicolosi to refute Gentili's thesis, because it seems obvious that Archilochus should have found himself on land like Synesius<sup>38</sup>. Little does it matter that Synesius is indignant at the cowardice of Cerealius, a Roman officer who remains on a ship in the open sea instead of landing and bringing help to besieged Cyrene — this is no good reason to make a parallel between Archilochus and Cerealius, and decide that Archilochus is on a ship too. The parallel suggested by Synesius rather concerns Archilochus and Synesius himself: so both of them are mounting guard on land (and, it follows, Archilochus is referring to a weapon and to no ship).

Obviously, Nicolosi is right in ruling out the wrong parallel and calling attention to the right one. To this I can simply add that, a little further on in the same letter, Synesius again explicitly insists on the difference between Cerealius' situation and his own, as that faint-hearted officer is standing not on the battlements as is Synesius himself, but near the rowers (οὐ γὰρ ἀρ'ἔπαλξιν ὄσπερ ἐγὼ, ἀλλὰ παρὰ κώπην). This rules out any possibility that the comparison with Archilochus made by Synesius may concern anything else than mounting guard on land. And this should settle the point.

— f. I deal here with a famous poem by Hybrias the Cretan (=fr. 909. 1-5 Page):

ἔστι<sup>39</sup> μοι πλοῦτος μέγας δόρυ καὶ ξίφος  
καὶ τὸ καλὸν λαισήον, πρόβλημα χρωτός·  
τούτῳ γὰρ ἄρῳ, τούτῳ θερίζω,  
τούτῳ πατέω τὸν ἀδὺν οἶνον ἀπ' ἀμπέλων,  
τούτῳ δεσπότης μνοΐας κέκλημαι<sup>40</sup>.

<sup>37</sup> Gentili 1965, pp. 131-134; Bossi 1980, and 1990<sup>2</sup>, pp. 70-71; Giannini 1988, p. 38 n. 29; Vetta 1999, pp. 18-19.

<sup>38</sup> Nicolosi 2005, pp. 35-37, and 2013, p. 63.

<sup>39</sup> Gulick 1971, p. 230 prefers to write ἔστι at Ath. 15. 695F.

<sup>40</sup> "Great wealth are my spear and sword"

This has always been regarded as an illuminating parallel to the Archilochean distich in question, at least since J. Dalechamps published his *Adnotationes* to Casaubon's edition of Athenaeus (1667); let me recall Tarditi and Ferrari among those who shared this opinion, but also D. Musti, who cannot be defined as an unconditional supporter of the "traditional" (δόρυ="spear") interpretation of fr. 2<sup>41</sup>. Obviously, scholars who deny the traditional interpretation are far from accepting the parallel between Hybrias and Archilochus. True, Gentili did not dwell on Hybrias' fragment<sup>42</sup>. But Bowra — apparently followed by Bossi many years later — thought that the fourfold repetition of the instrumental τούτῳ (without ἐν) made it impossible to compare the syntactically consistent structure of Hybrias' fragment with Archil. fr. 2, in which — according to the traditional interpretation — ἐν δόρῳ changes meaning on the third occurrence<sup>43</sup>.

Counterarguments: As explained above, a shift in the anaphora in Archil. fr. 2 is conceivable; indeed, it gives the couplet an even greater power to capture the attention of the public. As to the comparison between Hybrias and Archilochus, I believe that the affinity reaches well beyond syntax; it is the attitude, proudly described by Hybrias, of a soldier who feels sure to obtain all he needs and looks for thanks to his valour, and shows it by referring to his weapons (no matter whether spear or shield) — all of this recommends to compare the fragment by the Cretan poet to Archilochus' distich.

---

And my fine shield, protection of the body.  
With these I plough, with these I reap,  
With these I tread the sweet wine out of the vines,  
Through these I am greeted as master of serfs".

— An edition of the poem and a discussion of all the related problems can be found at <https://units.academia.edu/gennarotedeschi>.

<sup>41</sup> Dalechamps in Casaubon 1667, p. 810; besides, Liebel 1818<sup>2</sup>, p. 162; Tarditi 1968, p. 60 (who wrote of «*Hybriae imitatio certissima*»); Ferrari 2000, p. 145; Musti 2001, p. 30-33.

<sup>42</sup> Gentili 1965, p. 129 seemed to give little weight to this remarkable witness, although he acknowledged that it had kindled the interest of many.

<sup>43</sup> Bowra 1970, p. 68; cp. Bossi 1990<sup>2</sup>, p. 69.

### 3. How many interpretations of fr. 2 are there?

One of the aims of this paper was obviously to disprove Gentili's thesis, and I have refuted his arguments one by one.

Of course, as is already clear from many of the works I have mentioned, the debate went on after Davison and Gentili published their papers. While many started to look at the interpretation of the fragment offered by either of the two scholars as the obvious way of understanding it<sup>44</sup>, the reaction to the attempt to substitute the "ship" or the "plank" (actually, the "ship's deck") for the "spear" produced several contributions. I have quoted some (like Tarditi's, Felson's, Ferrari's), but I wish to refer also to M. L. West's translation of the distich<sup>45</sup>.

Not all scholars (both before and after Davison and Gentili's time) who understood δόρυ as "spear" agreed on every feature concerning the fragment. Some of them thought that comparison with a picture on the "Seven against Thebes" vase from Mykenai showing warriors who sling knapsacks (presumably with food and drink) from their spears clarified the scene described in fr. 2<sup>46</sup>. And sometimes this view is regarded as not inconsistent with a metaphorical interpretation of the words ἐν δορί. This reading of the fragment ("in the power of my spear") was suggested in a recent book by D. Clay<sup>47</sup>.

But the main difference among supporters of the spear theory concerned the construction of the verb κλίνομαι. According to some, κεκλιμένος did not govern ἐν δορί. Again, not all these latter agreed on

---

<sup>44</sup> To those I have already quoted for the past let me add the newly-published Inglese – Bongiorno (2013), a fine, small book, which offers a selection of Archilochean fragments with a translation and a commentary. Lasserre 1979, p. 54 n. 5 fundamentally agreed with the Davison – Gentili theory, but he thought that κεκλιμένος was connected with πίνω and not with ἐν δορί; so he translated: "Dans mon bateau, je bois couché", and not "je bois couché dans mon bateau".

<sup>45</sup> West 1993, p. 13:

"On my spear's my daily bread,

On my spear my wine

From Ismaros; and drinking it,

It's on my spear I recline".

— Even earlier than Tarditi did Marzullo 1965, pp. 6-7 refute the "ship theory"; he rightly defined the interpretation of ἐν δορί as ἐν νηί «una sforzatura, che riesce intollerabile, quando la si colleghi a μᾶζα e a οἶνος».

<sup>46</sup> Mingazzini 1967; Schuchhardt 1969; more recently, Podlecki 1984, p. 41. Also West's translation seems to imply this idea.

<sup>47</sup> Clay 2004, pp. 50-51.

the interpretation of the rest of the fragment. According to van Groningen, Archilochus means that he is on duty (ἐν δορῖ) and far from sharing the comfortable life of the couching symposion, but this does not prevent him from enjoying his drink anyway: the Dutch scholar thought that κεκλιμένος referred metaphorically to the right way of joining a drinking party<sup>48</sup>. Others (D. Arnould, A. P. Burnett, C. O. Pavese) also understood ἐν δορῖ as “under arms” or “in arms”, “being equipped with weapons”, but they — in a more natural way than van Groningen — interpreted κεκλιμένος as “lying”. They were all pushed both by the wish to assign one and the same meaning to all three occurrences of ἐν δορῖ, and by the belief that κεκλιμένος constructed with ἐν could not indicate “leaning on”. So this interpretation put together the meaning “spear”, traditionally assigned to δόρυ in fr. 2, and Gentili’s objection concerning the construction of κεκλιμένος. Here is, for instance, Arnould’s translation:

Armé de ma lance, j’ai une galette petrie, armé de ma lance, j’ai du vin d’Ismaros, mais, pour le boire, armé de ma lance, je suis allongé<sup>49</sup>.

Not very different from this was Pavese’s:

In armi ho la pagnotta impastata, in armi il vino  
Ismarico, bevo in armi reclinato<sup>50</sup>.

This same idea that all Archilochus’ life is focused on his military experience was expressed by somewhat different translations like those that represent the spear as a paradoxical convivial bed<sup>51</sup>.

According to Musti<sup>52</sup>, the history of symposion began with this scanty meal and luxurious drink which Archilochus shared with none, availing himself of no array for dinner, but wearing his spear.

Now, Archilochus is rightly famous for his taste for paradoxes, but never — to my knowledge — does he pride himself on faring better than others while drawing on lesser resources. And, even less, does he

---

<sup>48</sup> Van Groningen 1930, p. 78 translated the last clause as «*dum vigilo, bibo verus commissator*».

<sup>49</sup> Arnould 1980, p. 293. Cp. Burnett 1983, p. 39: «For me there’s risen bread in my spear, Ismarian/wine in my spear, and when I drink I couch with my spear».

<sup>50</sup> Pavese 1995, p. 340.

<sup>51</sup> See Romagnoli 1936, p. 33; Del Grande 1959<sup>3</sup>, p. 61; and Pontani 1969, p. 115.

<sup>52</sup> Musti 2001, pp. 30-31.

pity himself. Both would be unworthy of a man who more than once showed how conscious he was of his superiority by unmasking the hypocrisy of his fellow-citizens<sup>53</sup>.

Besides, L.–S.–J., s. v. κλίνω II 4 records no occurrences of κλίνομαι meaning “to recline at meals” from authors earlier than the fifth century B.C.. Nor do I find any examples of passages as ancient as that in the contributions concerning fr. 2. Such a long time intervening between Archilochus and the earliest sure testimony on reclining at meals in Greece (Alcm. fr. 19 Page=11 Calame) makes it rather unlikely that our poet was parodying a habit which perhaps had not been established in Greece yet<sup>54</sup>. So, also from this point of view, I find no reason to dismiss the traditional way of understanding fr. 2<sup>55</sup>.

I have left mention of a few more attempts at explaining fr. 2, which have not obtained a broad consensus, for the end of this section. One is barely worth mentioning. L. G. Pocock<sup>56</sup> rightly thought that the fine play of repetitions and alliterations in the distich suggested that it was a complete poem. But he also believed that the couplet was a riddle, whose solution was “wood” or “tree”: the wood where the barley cake was kneaded came out of a tree; and a tree, the vine, gave the

---

<sup>53</sup> Of course, fr. 5 does not celebrate an act of cowardice like throwing away the shield, but points out the difference between appearances and the true meaning of someone’s behaviour: if Archilochus has thrown away his shield unwillingly and wants to buy a new one soon (i.e., if he is willing to fight), he should not be regarded as a coward. Besides, the other way round, Archilochus implies that those *thousand* men of fr. 101 should not be regarded as brave warriors, who take pride on having killed *seven* enemies. In this latter tetrameter fragment the act of dragging away the killed enemies ironically evokes an epic atmosphere, as the public is reminded of Odysseus dragging away the defeated Iros (*Od.* 18. 100-102) — but this irony expresses the will to avoid any base simulation of military valour, and so it is far from being hostile to traditional warrior ethics.

<sup>54</sup> The oldest evidence on the couching drinking-party dates back to ca. 600 B. C. (Alcm. fr. 19 Page=11 Calame). This was confirmed by Burkert 1991, pp. 17-18, and, against Murray 1994, even by Węcowski 2002, p. 626 n3, and 2010–2012, p. 20. So this makes it likely that by Archilochus’ time the symposion had not reached its fully developed form yet, which included couching: see Rösler 1976, 302-303 n. 24.

<sup>55</sup> Nor does persuade me Gentili’s effort (see 1970, p. 120; 1976, p. 20) to support his interpretation by referring to the figure of Dionysus lying on ship’s deck in the famous Munich Exekias’ cup; whether the scene depicted on it alludes to the myth told in the Homeric Hymn to Dionysus (see Paleothodoros 2012, pp. 462-463, with whom I agree) or not, the picture concerns a divinity and not everyday human life (cp. Pavese 1995, p. 339 n. 10). And none of the iconographical material referred to by Paleothodoros 2012, p. 480 n. 61 is earlier than 570 B. C..

<sup>56</sup> Pocock 1961.

wine; and out of a tree came the wood of the ship's deck where Archilochus lay drinking. But Synesius did not see any riddle in the Archilochean lines, as we have seen, and I think to have refuted this curious explanation together with the “ship-theory”.

G. Giangrande's theory was almost as surprising. This great scholar proposed to understand δόρυ as “pillory”: Archilochus would be suffering this humiliating punishment (for which crimes?) and making a show of his superior spirit by eating and drinking in public. But, of course, nothing authorizes (least of all, the context of the sources preserving our distich, Athenaeus and Synesius) this attempt to impose on Archilochus the same treatment reserved to the contemptible Artemon in Anac. fr. 388.7 Page<sup>57</sup>.

Lastly, A. L. Boegehold thought that our distich should be interpreted as a funerary epigram. But his arguments do not seem to me to be cogent<sup>58</sup>.

#### 4. A comparison between Archilochus and Hesiod and what can be drawn out of it

Some indications can be drawn from a well-known parallel between our fragment and Hes. *Op.* 588-596, a passage which describes the best way to enjoy summertime. Here it is, according to West's 1978 edition:

ἀλλὰ τότε ἤδη  
εἴη πετραίη τε σκιῇ καὶ Βίβλινος οἶνος

590 μᾶζα τ' ἀμολγαίη γάλα τ' αἰγῶν σβεννουμένων  
καὶ βοῶς ὑλοφάγοιο κρέας μὴ πω τετοκυῖης  
πρωτογόνων τ' ἐρίφων· ἐπὶ δ' αἴθοπα πινέμεν οἶνον  
ἐν σκιῇ ἐζόμενον, κεκορημένος ἦτορ ἐδωδῆς,  
ἀντίον ἀκραέος Ζεφύρου τρέψαντα πρόσωπα·

595 κρήνης δ' αἰενάου καὶ ἀπορρύτου, ἢ τ' ἀθόλωτος  
τρις ὕδατος προχέειν, τὸ δὲ τέτρατον ἰέμεν οἴνου<sup>59</sup>.

<sup>57</sup> Giangrande 1972.

<sup>58</sup> Boegehold 2008.

<sup>59</sup>

“But then

let it be good to enjoy the shade of a rock and Bibling wine,  
590 And bread made with milk (?), and milk from goats past suckling,  
And meat of a heifer feeding in the woods that has not yet begot,  
And of first-born kids; besides, drink fiery wine,  
Sitting in the shade, after one has eaten one's fill,



Arnould and, in more detail, Bossi independently pinpointed many correspondences between Hesiod and our Archilochean fragment, which have been recently recalled by A. Nikolaev<sup>60</sup>: Βίβλινος οἶνος ~ οἶνος Ἴσμαρικός, μᾶζα ἀμολγαίη ~ μᾶζα μεμαγμένη, πινέμεν ~ πίνω, ἐν σκιῇ ἐζόμενον ~ ἐν δορὶ κεκλιμένος. Now, this connection with Hesiod is much more likely to be well-founded than the polemic against sympotic luxury, which some read in the fragment: and this not only because it is supported by very neat correspondences (and oppositions, as will be shown in a moment), but also for the very simple reason that Hesiod expresses himself as though one person was eating and drinking all alone like Archilochus.

As for correspondences and oppositions, Bibline wine was of the same high standard as the Ismarian (no matter, of course, whether the latter really existed or was just Homer's invention). On the contrary, the quality of the μᾶζα ἀμολγαίη was obviously higher than that of the ordinary μᾶζα μεμαγμένη: the former was food for a well-to-do landowner like Hesiod<sup>61</sup>, the latter was — at least, at its worst — made for sailors and slaves, as we will see in a minute. But attention is obviously attracted by the antithesis ἐν σκιῇ ἐζόμενον ~ ἐν δορὶ κεκλιμένος. To sit in the shade is certainly much more comfortable than ἐν δορὶ κεκλίσθαι, whatever you think it to mean. To sum up, there are some obvious differences between the situations described by Hesiod and by Archilochus: Hesiod's food (which is not confined to barley cake) is of a high quality and much varied, Archilochus' scanty and poor; Hesiod pictures himself sitting in the shade and enjoying the fresh breeze, whereas Archilochus is mounting guard (or he is enjoying a very uncomfortable break while engaged at war). So, we have a very complicated antithesis with one exception: high-quality wine is available to both poets. Much detail in Hesiod, great synthesis in Archilochus: really, the most significant point in common is the fact — undervalued, so far — that each of the two poets has his meal and drink

---

With one's face turned towards the brisk Zephyrus;  
595 And from an ever-flowing source, which is untroubled,  
Pour three parts of water, and a fourth of wine".

<sup>60</sup> Arnould 1980, p. 293; Bossi 1980, pp. 26-27, and 1990<sup>2</sup>, p. 75; cp. Nikolaev 2014, p. 13.

<sup>61</sup> This is so, whatever the exact meaning of ἀμολγαίη; West 1978, p. 307 thinks of «emmer soaked in milk, or bread leavened with milk».

alone<sup>62</sup>. Why think that Archilochus is polemicizing against the luxury of symposia (i.e. group drinking), as Giannini and some others believe<sup>63</sup>, if the link with the Hesiodic lonely banqueter scene is evident enough? On the other hand, I do not see how the opposition between the Hesiodic and the Archilochean description could support the thesis that ἐν δορὶ κεκλιμένος means “lying on ship’s deck”, as Bossi maintained<sup>64</sup>: the simple fact that Hesiod is sitting (l. 593: ἐζόμενον) does not suffice, because standing (while leaning on one’s spear) is no less opposed to sitting than lying. Nor do I understand why the reference to the Ismarian wine should mean that Archilochus is going to lie down while wearing his weapon because he will get drunk, as Arnould thought<sup>65</sup>! Why on earth should Archilochus play the clown and compare himself to the repelling Cyclops defeated by means of the Ismarian wine instead of associating himself with the victorious Odysseus? Besides, in the first place, the act of lying down while wearing a weapon is as clumsy and uncomfortable as the idea is far-fetched; and, secondly, the elegy seems a rather unusual poetical genre to foster farcical moods. On this latter point I should like to dwell a little.

### 5. *Is Archilochean elegy in earnest?*

The praiseworthy effort to mark the difference between Archilochus and Homer against the earlier tendency to an excessive assimilation of the former’s *Weltanschauung* to the latter’s has led some scholars to propose a unilateral interpretation of our poet’s mood as ‘anti-heroic’; luckily a subtle paper by L. A. Swift has very recently shown how many *nuances* can be recognized both in Homer and in Archilochus as to a warrior’s duties (and their limits) concerning — for instance —

---

<sup>62</sup> Another point in common might be the Thracian origin of both Hesiod’s Bibline wine and Archilochus’ Ismarian, provided that Bibline wine came from Thracia, as shown by West 1978, p. 306, at least for the fifth century B. C..

<sup>63</sup> Giannini 1988, p. 38; cp. the already quoted contributions by Arnould and Burnett and, moreover, Nicolosi 2013 referred to below. Ornaghi 2009, p. 244 n. 116 rightly noticed that Archilochus gives no evaluation of the symposium at all.

<sup>64</sup> Bossi 1980, p. 27 and 1990<sup>2</sup>, p. 75.

<sup>65</sup> Arnould 1980, pp. 293-294.

whether and when retreat in battle should be allowed and, at the same time, to what degree honour and prestige could suffer from it<sup>66</sup>.

The tendency to create an anti-heroic Archilochus is parallel and related to another development in research, which consists in playing down the difference of inspiration between elegy and iambus inside Archilochean poetry. Let me take two most recent contributions by two distinguished scholars for examples: A. Nikolaev's «Epic Party» and A. Nicolosi's edition of Archilochus' *Elegie*<sup>67</sup>.

Nikolaev calls attention to the use in fr. 4. 9 of νηφέμεν, an aeolism which sounds Homeric but was coined from a verb not attested in the epic language<sup>68</sup>, in order to contrast the expected severity of the night-watch with the use of daily language, wittily disguised as the lofty words of true heroes; but, then, this scholar adds that that only word which would prove Archilochus' ironical aims points to Hesiod's famous picture of the feasting land-owner in *Op.* 582-594 (already discussed here above), where the aeolism πινέμεν is to be read (l. 5)<sup>69</sup>. Now, I find it rather difficult to conceive that a joking reference to a peaceful drinking-man in Hesiod might serve the purpose of parodying Homeric heroic moods<sup>70</sup>. In my opinion, an unprejudiced examination of fr. 4 leads to the almost safe conclusion that a dangerous situation is being described. And the demand that wine be given out unsparingly and without any delay might suggest all but a playful atmosphere.

Nicolosi<sup>71</sup> sees «la frustrazione del simposio negato» in our fr. 2, and she thinks that a «*Stimmung* seriocomica» characterized all Archilochus' production and even his elegies. Now, as explained above, it is far from sure that Archilochus had in mind to compare his uncomfortable way of drinking with the symposion of couching drinkmates. One who proudly declares himself to be “the lord Enyalios' servant” is not frustrated by the uneasy conditions imposed by war. And, again, why compare a lonely drinker to symposiasts at all? As to the alleged seriocomic *Stimmung* of Archilochus' elegiac production, I

<sup>66</sup> Swift (2012), who lists and criticizes both supporters of a Homeric Archilochus and opposers of such theory; cp. Barker – Christensen (2006).

<sup>67</sup> Nikolaev 2014; Nicolosi 2013.

<sup>68</sup> Already had Monaco 1960, p. 19 remarked that «νήφειν è verbo d'uso comune e non poetico».

<sup>69</sup> Nikolaev 2014, p. 19.

<sup>70</sup> On the other hand, at least true Homericisms are not necessarily ironical: think, for instance, of fr. 13, where Archilochus mourns for friends of his, and he uses the formula πολυφλοίσβοιο θαλάσσης (l. 3).

<sup>71</sup> Nicolosi 2013, p. 21.

have already pointed to some examples of his serious inspiration in this genre — as fr. 4, 5, 13<sup>72</sup>. Indeed, which of the eighteen fragments forming the elegiac section of Archilochus in West's edition can be said to have a comic aim? I believe none (except that fr. 10 is too lacunose to be understood) — not even the shield one, where prejudice is criticized but military valour is substantially reasserted (Archilochus refuses to die in order to save his shield but is ready to buy a new one in order to fight)<sup>73</sup>.

### 6. Barley cake and Ismarian wine

The point I am trying to make is that, although irony is used by Archilochus also in his elegies sometimes (as in fr. 5), this does not imply a will to convey an anti-heroic *Weltanschauung* and, even less, to express feelings similar to those characteristic of iambic poetry<sup>74</sup>.

On the other hand, the almost obsessive concentration on the meaning of the words ἐν δορὶ has apparently kept scholars from trying to solve the enigma represented by the remarkable couple formed by simple, even poor food, the μᾶζα, and a choice wine, the οἶνος Ἴσμαρικός. Strangely enough, such contrast has been often remarked, but never explained satisfactorily. The first to take notice of such amazing contradiction — at least in modern times — was van Groningen, who thought to solve the problem by denying the historical existence of the Ismarian wine<sup>75</sup> (but, if we regard this wine just as mythical, the contrast between it and the rough barley cake might even get sharper!). Many years later, Davison touched upon the matter by referring to Ath. 1. 30f, who recalled Archilochus' praise of two wines, the Naxian and the Ismarian (fr. 290 and, of course, 2) — indeed, as

<sup>72</sup> I suspect that the ascription of the serio-comic element to elegy may derive from the widely shared persuasion that it was chiefly sung at an apparently merry event as the symposion. The idea that elegy was gone through almost exclusively at symposia is criticized by Aloni 2009, pp. 169-170. On the chronological limits of the *spoudogeloion* (much later than the archaic age) see Riu 2008, p. 89 n. 26. — I cannot accept the theory proposed by Steiner 2012 that fr. 13 should be interpreted as a sort of allegory of the symposion (to which no reference is made) instead of a commemoration of the victims of a shipwreck.

<sup>73</sup> Cp. n. 53 above.

<sup>74</sup> On the difference between elegiac and iambic poetry cp. Carey 2009, p. 24: «Elegy is more decorous... perhaps because of the formal kinship with epic».

<sup>75</sup> Van Groningen 1930, p. 75.

both the island of Naxos and the Thracian town of Ismaros lie within the areas of the military operations in which our poet took part, he might well have tasted both wines, as was later remarked by Arnould<sup>76</sup>. This French scholar and, some years earlier, Rankin thought the contrast in question to be a comic feature of the fragment<sup>77</sup>. But I do not think that any comic effect could be obtained by placing the poor barley cake and the fabulous Ismarian wine side by side: disparaging both food and drink, or ironically exalting both, would have made a much clearer impression on the audience.

Even if the wine was the fruit of plunder<sup>78</sup>, such explanation — narrowly realistic, as though the poet were writing his diary — can be persuasive only up to a certain point<sup>79</sup>; it can be only one level of the correct interpretation. We are entitled to expect much more from the man who could so effectively fit together his association with Ares and his acquaintance with the Muses in fr. 1.

So, none of the explanations proposed deals with the real matter.

This compels me to look for a possible solution elsewhere. Some help can come from a remark confined to a note by Burnett: «The poem reflects a kind of priamel: one man loves bread, another wine, a third the symposium, but I trade all for the soldier's life»<sup>80</sup>. As I said above, I do not agree about the symposium; besides, I am not sure that any priamel is presupposed, but Burnett was right to make it clear that the distich should be understood as a synthesis of what our poet believes (a soldier's) life to be.

The  $\mu\alpha\zeta\alpha$  is apparently barley cake, originally at least just kneaded and not baked, as can be gathered from Soph. fr. 563 Radt

---

<sup>76</sup> Davison 1960, p. 2; Arnould 1980, p. 292.

<sup>77</sup> Rankin 1972, p. 471; Arnould 1980, pp. 293-294. It is far from sure that there is anything comic about it. Nor do I agree with the more cautious line taken by Felson Rubin 1981, p. 7 (she sees a note of humour in the semantic shift of Archilochus' anaphora) or by Corrêa 2009<sup>2</sup>, pp. 95-103 (in her opinion, there is a «mudança de registro» from the Homeric gravity of l. 1 to the drinking posture of Archilochus who leans on his spear in l. 2).

<sup>78</sup> This suggestion is made by Davison 1960, p. 2 and Gentili 1965, p. 129.

<sup>79</sup> Why should Archilochus have obtained only excellent wine through plunder and not also at least good food? The question is posed by Perotti 1985, pp. 227-228.

<sup>80</sup> Burnett 1983, p. 38 n. 15.

(=563 Lloyd-Jones=563 Pearson), Hdt. 1. 200 and schol. Ar. *Eq.* 55<sup>81</sup>. It is connected with a very old-fashioned and austere diet (Epicurus *Ep. Men.* p. 64 Usener; Ath. 4. 137e); it is good for soldiers (mercenary troops: Democr. fr. 246 D.–K.<sup>82</sup>), Spartans (Plut. *Alc.* 23. 3; *Cleom.* 13. 5), and people of a very low social position (Ar. *Eccl.* 606). Its name is used almost as an antonomasia for the servile condition by Aeschylus (*Ag.* 1041: δουλίας μάζης βίον<sup>83</sup>). But, even earlier, Hipponax associated a kind of barley bread to a subhuman life, worthy of slaves (fr. 36. 6 Degani=26. 6 W.: κριθινον κόλλικα, δούλιον χόρτον). And this line might be a parody of Archil. fr. dub. 193. 6 T. (δούλιον ἄρτον ἔδων), if R. Reitzenstein, B. Snell and others were right in ascribing it to Archilochus<sup>84</sup>. Anyway, the μᾶζα certainly occurs in another ferocious fragment of Hipponax' (8 W.=28 Degani), where it is associated to other food deemed apt for despicable φάρμακοι (“scapegoats”)<sup>85</sup>. We can only be sure that our poet alludes to a hard, unpleasant way of living, a sailor's existence, by referring to a kind of food consumed by the poor like figs: ἔα Πάρον καὶ σῦκα κείνα καὶ θαλάσσιον βίον (fr. 116; cp. fr. 250)<sup>86</sup>.

Ismarian wine is mainly famous for appearing in the ninth book of *Odyssey*. A first possible sense of the opposition barley

<sup>81</sup> Cp. Giannini 1988, p. 36 and Pearson's commentary. The meaning of the passage can be fully understood, if one accepts Pearson's correction φυρᾶτε of the *lectio tradita* φορεῖτε at l. 1.

<sup>82</sup> This is not to imply that I think that Archilochus was a mercenary, and even less that I agree with those — see, for instance, Theunissen 1953, pp. 407-408 — who infer such condition from fr. 2.

<sup>83</sup> I accept Blomfield's conjecture mentioned in the apparatus of Page 1982<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>84</sup> The discussion is summarized by Nicolosi 2007, 17-27. The main argument in favour of the attribution of the fragment to Archilochus is the great influence of Homer on the author of this poem as to both the language and the images used. West (see Hipp. fr. 115 W.) and others attribute the fragment to the Ephesian.

<sup>85</sup> κάφῃ παρέξειν ἰσχάδας τε καὶ μᾶζαν  
καὶ τυρόν, οἶον ἐσθίουσι φάρμακοί.

“and with his hands would he offer dried figs and barley cake  
and cheese — of the quality that is suitable for scapegoats to eat”.

The translation of κάφῃ (probably, “with his hands”) is under debate: see Degani 1991<sup>2</sup>, p. 44.

<sup>86</sup> Again, the μᾶζα is associated to a very poor diet in two comic fragments by Poliuchus and by Antiphanes quoted by Ath. 2. 60 b-e, the former of which links the μᾶζα μεμαγμένη with a wine of low quality (οινάριον ἀμφίβολον); this reads like a parody of our fragment working upon the incongruity of the Ismarian wine with the barley cake.

cake/Ismarian wine depends on the context, a precarious refreshment for a soldier on service: the poorness of the food and the excellence of the wine are put under the clearest light by the mutual contrast. So, first of all, it seems that the mean, dark aspects of life (of military life, and of life at large), alluded to by the poor barley cake, are opposed to those of abundance and confidence, alluded to by the precious wine.

Secondly, a deeper and subtler link may connect the couple μᾶζα μεμαγμένη / οἶνος Ἴσμαρικός. The μᾶζα in question is made with very plain ingredients and with a very simple technique, but all the same its being μεμαγμένη shows that some care has been spent in the preparation: in *Ar. Eq.* 1105 the Sausage-Seller offers μαζίσκας γε διαμεμαγμένας as good food, which — as he specifies — is ready to be eaten<sup>87</sup>. So, being food ready to be consumed is one of the assets of the μᾶζα — barley (or wheat) flour kneaded and moulded into a sort of cakes<sup>88</sup>. This careful preparation of the humble food seems to allude to Archilochus' capacity to cope with the deprivations suffered on campaign<sup>89</sup>. And, if not, what in the context of fr. 2 would be the use of specifying that the cake is kneaded? If we do not want to take μᾶζα μεμαγμένη simply as a pleonasm (which would be un-Archilochian) or just as a style figure<sup>90</sup>, then this prosaic locution may have been chosen to express the will to face the inconvenience of war<sup>91</sup>.

<sup>87</sup> ἐγὼ δὲ μαζίσκας γε διαμεμαγμένας  
καὶ τοῦτον ὀπτόν· μηδὲν ἄλλ' εἰ μὴ ῥοθίε.  
“Instead, I will offer you small well-kneaded cakes,  
and roasted food; you have only to eat”.

L.–S.–J., s. v. wrongly translates διαμάσσω with “bake to a turn”. *DGE* s. v. correctly explains it as “amasar”.

<sup>88</sup> This process is described by *Th.* 4. 16.1.

<sup>89</sup> Kneading was described as...a labour worthy of Heracles in comedy before Aristophanes' times: *Ar. Pax* 741-742.

<sup>90</sup> This is Arnould's opinion (1980, p. 292).

<sup>91</sup> One could even go further and recall that another passage from Aristophanes witnesses that «kneading a cake» was later employed idiomatically to indicate success obtained. Here it is (*Eq.* 54-57):

καὶ πρόφην γ' ἔμοῦ	
μᾶζαν μεμαχότος ἐν Πύλῳ Λακωνικὴν,	55
πανουργότατά πως περιδραμὼν ὑφαρπάσας	
αὐτὸς παρέθηκε τὴν ὑπ' ἔμοῦ μεμαγμένην.	
“And sometime ago	
I kneaded a Laconian cake in Pylos,	55
But he ( <i>sc.</i> Cleon) most cunningly stole it with a quick move,	
And he himself served it up, although I had kneaded it”.	

The modest, even shabby, conditions of life imposed on the Greeks taking part in the war against the Thracians on the coast near Thasos are very different from the standard of Homeric characters — that is why I think it is no chance that Archilochus puts into the scene the μᾶζα, a kind of food and a word never mentioned by Homer and by his carnivorous heroes — a circumstance that has not perhaps been duly considered.

We have some clearer clue concerning the Ismarian wine. Starting at least with the sixties, many scholars have underlined the strong resemblance between the figures of Archilochus and Odysseus. K. Latte has pointed to some common traits of the two “biographies”; J. Russo to the capacity, innate in both, to distinguish between the outer appearance and the inner character; B. Seidensticker to the inclination of both to ascribe to themselves attitudes which *apparently* contradict the traditional standards of military courage; to their lives spent in wars and adventures on the sea; and to the fact that each of them can report his own deeds (true or invented) reaching a high poetic standard<sup>92</sup>.

More than one scholar has seen the link connecting Archilochus’ dangerous Thracian campaign against the Saioi near Ismaros and Odysseus’ desperate fight against the Cicons<sup>93</sup>.

Ismaros was the first place where Odysseus and his men landed after leaving Ilion (*Od.* 9. 39). It should be noted that on this occasion the hero’s behaviour was cautious since the beginning. He raided the town in order to collect provisions, and then urged his companions to sail away as soon as possible; but they did not obey, and, instead, indulged in drinking (9. 45: ἔνθα δὲ πόλλον μὲν μέθυ πίνετο). Presently, they were attacked by another group of Cicons, thirsty for revenge, and many were killed. This is the first time in this story that wine made somebody forget to be wary of danger. Again, later on (9. 347-352), Odysseus offered Ismarian wine to Polyphemus in order that the latter

---

— The passage alludes to the victory on Spartans obtained through timely action and with great skill by the strategos Demosthenes in Pylos in 424, the merit of which was usurped by his colleague Cleon. Of course, nobody knows when the idiomatic expression was originated; but it might even have been long before Aristophanes’ time (cp. Lasserre 1979, pp. 53-54; *contra*, West in the apparatus of his edition).

<sup>92</sup> Latte 1964; Russo 1974; Seidensticker 1978; cp. already Stanford 1954, pp. 90-91.

<sup>93</sup> See, for instance, Burnett’s remark (1983, p. 39 n. 16) concerning fr. 2: «It is possible that Archilochus means to compare himself with Odysseus, for at *Od.* 9. 451 that hero is on the coast of Thrace, at Ismaros, plundering and drinking wine». — In addition, the reference to Ismaros might imply a reference to Apollo, ὃς Ἴσμαρον ἀμφιβεβήκει (*Hom. Od.* 9. 198).



might go to sleep and be attacked by surprise. From the start of his adventure in the land of the Cyclopes, the hero attached great importance to this wine. In his tale to the Phaeacians he dwelt on the fact that he had taken a barrel of it with him for the apparently strange reason that he was going to meet a dangerous and savage man (9. 212-215). So, he had been looking to this wine as to a weapon long before being shut inside the cave by Polyphemus. Indeed, this curious weapon was terribly effective, because it was almost impossible to resist the attraction of such drink, and because it was highly intoxicating (9. 201-211)<sup>94</sup>. It is clear that Odysseus' companions showed themselves unable to dominate their fondness for pleasure, and to behave rationally when they yielded themselves to drinking instead of ensuring their own safety through a timely escape — in the same way as Polyphemus, unwarily confident in his strength, drank his fill of the inebriating wine. On the contrary, Odysseus kept himself clear-minded and far-sighted, and, in the end, saved himself accordingly.

As the Cicons were later called Saioi, which is the name of the people referred to in fr. 5<sup>95</sup>, the mention of the Ismarian wine could connect fr. 2 with a crucial event in Archilochus' life, which included the remarkable decision to run away — a decision which appeared to him to be as reasonable as Odysseus judged to be the flight in vain recommended to his companions in the land of the Cicons.

It is all the more likely, then, that the reference to the Ismarian wine (with the adjective Ἰσμαρικὸς strongly emphasized by the *enjambement*) was aimed at calling attention to the link between Archilochus and Odysseus<sup>96</sup>.

The exact purport of the reference to the μᾶζα μεμαγμένη in this context can, of course, be doubted. What can hardly be denied is the

---

<sup>94</sup> It is interesting that Odysseus had obtained the Ismarian wine from a priest of Apollo, Maron, as a token of gratitude for sparing him and his family when he overcame the Cicons: so the gift received in exchange for a generous act offered Odysseus the means of partially driving away the effects of the ungenerous behaviour of the Cyclops.

<sup>95</sup> Hsch. s.v. Σάϊοι· ...οἱ πρότερον Κίκονες. Cp. Seidensticker 1978, pp. 20-22.

<sup>96</sup> Besides, in a comparatively long speech in the *Iliad* (19. 155-183) Odysseus himself enlarges on the necessity that warriors eat and drink adequately before fighting, because strength and courage are provided by a good meal (160-161: πάσασθαι ...σίτου καὶ οἴνοιο· τὸ γὰρ μένος ἐστὶ καὶ ἀλκή). This passage is interesting, even though no specific mention of *Ismarian* wine occurs. It suggests that the tense moments preceding battle might well be the context of fr. 2.

connection between the μᾶζα μεμαγμένη and Archilochus' acceptance of his condition as a soldier. And also the link of the Ismarian wine with the Odysseiac resourcefulness<sup>97</sup>.

Fr. 2 insists three times on the poet's acceptance of his condition, which can well represent Necessity at large: (1) hardships can well be coped with by him who is satisfied with little and is committed to military life; and who, of course, (2) is ready to enjoy the best that such life may offer (which is alluded to through the mention of the precious wine), but who (3) will do so "leaning on his spear" — that is, without neglecting the impending dangers, a mistake made by Odysseus' unwary companions and by Polyphemus.

From another point of view, Archilochus may be implying that there is some relation between the ability to face hardships (the quality of being πολύτλας, in the Odysseiac language<sup>98</sup>), and the ability to find one's way out of dangers through one's shrewdness (the quality of being πολύμητις).

This substantial unity of the meaning of the fragment is underlined by the effect brought about by the several alliterations of nasal and sibilant sounds<sup>99</sup>; the triple anaphora of ἐν δορί indicates the complete absorption of Archilochus in military life, which includes even taking rest while drinking and staying on the alert at the same time<sup>100</sup>.

---

<sup>97</sup> Resourcefulness and belief in action are ascribed to both Archilochus and Odysseus by Kirkwood 1974, p. 36.

<sup>98</sup> Τλημοσύνη has an important place in Archilochus' poetry: see his fr. 13 and cp. Heitsch 1964.

<sup>99</sup> The phonic structure of the fragment is analysed by Aloni 1981, pp. 49-55.

<sup>100</sup> Generally speaking, Archilochus interpreted life according to what B. Snell called «the law of eternal change» or «law of alternation», a way of looking at Becoming of which instances are found also in Homer, Hesiod and others: see Snell 1953, pp. 42-69; Krause 1976, pp. 17-21; 61-67. The variety of this "theory" which is proposed by Archilochus considers change from good times to bad times in life, and viceversa, to be completely independent from good or bad personal behaviour. In fact, ill fate strikes now one now another (fr. 13), and the value of each man is proportional to his capacity of resisting the temptation of exalting himself or getting depressed because of good or bad luck: what we have to do is simply to acknowledge Necessity — γίνωσκ' ὄϊος ῥυσμὸς ἀνθρώπους ἔχει (fr. 128). The law of alternation is to be recognized also in different personal tastes (fr. 25), in the humiliation of the great or the exaltation of the small (fr. 130), and in the exclusive influence of circumstances on our ideas (fr. 131-132). — For some time I have considered the possibility of interpreting the couple barley cake/Ismarian wine as another occurrence of such law. But the instances of it which are commonly accepted are composed of definite

### 7. *Some final remarks*

What are then the results of this inquiry?

First of all, I have shown in many ways that the traditional interpretation of fr. 2 (the “spear theory”) is not only acceptable from a syntactical point of view, but much richer in significance than the Davison and Gentili’s “ship or plank theory”.

Secondly, I have offered the first attempt at explaining the incongruous association of the barley cake and the Ismarian wine, and dwelt on the relation between the characters of Archilochus and Odysseus.

In addition, thirdly, I have argued in favour of the seriousness of Archilochus’ elegy.

### Abbreviations and references

Aloni 1981: A. Aloni, *Le Muse di Archiloco: ricerche sullo stile archilocheo*, Copenhagen 1981

Aloni 2009: A. Aloni, *Elegy. Forms, Functions, and Communication*, in Budelmann 2009, pp. 168-188

Arnould 1980: D. Arnould, *Archiloque et le vin d’Ismaros (Fr. 2 Diehl = 2 West = 7 Lasserre – Bonnard)*, “Revue de philologie, de littérature et d’histoire anciennes” 54 (1980), pp. 284-294

---

opposites (χαρτά and κακά, “delights” and “ills”, for example, as in fr. 128.6) or, at least, include different tastes; besides, Archilochus is having cake and wine at the same time.

- Barker – Christensen 2006: E. T. E. Barker – J. P. Christensen, *Flight Club: The New Archilochus Fragment and Its Resonance with Homeric Epic*, “Materiali e discussioni per l’analisi dei testi classici” 57 (2006), pp. 9-41
- Boegehold 2008: A. L. Boegehold, *Ways of Reading Archilochos Fr. 2 West*, in Katsonopoulou – Petropoulos – Katsarou 2008, pp. 181-188
- Bossi 1980: F. Bossi, *Archil. fr. 2 (e 4) W.*, in “Quaderni Urbinati di cultura classica” 5 (1980), pp. 23-27
- Bossi 1990<sup>2</sup>: F. Bossi, *Studi su Archiloco*, Bari 1990<sup>2</sup>
- Bowra 1970: C. M. Bowra, *A Couplet of Archilochus*, in C. M. Bowra, *On Greek Margins*, Oxford 1970, pp. 67-71
- Broccia 2005: G. Broccia, *Archiloco 1 W. Un tentativo di messa a punto*, “Rivista di filologia e di istruzione classica” 133 (2005), pp. 385-391
- Budermann 2009: F. Budermann (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Lyric*, Cambridge 2009
- Burkert 1991: W. Burkert, *Oriental Symposia: Contrasts and Parallels*, in W. J. Slater (ed.), *Dining in a Classical Context*, Ann Arbor, Mich. 1991, pp. 7-24
- Burnett 1983: A. P. Burnett, *Three Archaic Poets. Archilochus, Alcaeus, Sappho*, London 1983
- Calame 1983: C. Calame (ed.), *Alcman*, Romae 1983
- Campbell 1967: D. A. Campbell, *Greek Lyric Poetry. A Selection of Early Greek Lyric, Elegiac and Iambic Poetry*, London 1967
- Campbell 1990<sup>2</sup>: D. A. Campbell (ed.), *Greek Lyric. I. Sappho and Alcaeus*, Cambridge, Mass. – London, England 1990<sup>2</sup>

- Carey 2009: C. Carey, *Genre, Occasion, and Performance*, in Budelmann 2009, pp. 21-38
- Casaubon 1657: I. Casaubon (ed.), *Athenaei Deipnosophistarum libri quindecim cum I. Dalechampii Latina versione*, Lugduni 1657
- Chamoux 1957: F. Chamoux, *L'Athéna mélancolique*, "Bulletin de correspondance hellénique", 81 (1957), pp. 141-159
- Clay 2004: D. Clay, *Archilochos Heros. The Cult of Poets in the Greek Polis*, Washington, D. C. – Cambridge, Mass. 2004
- Corrêa 2009: P. Corrêa, *Armas e Varões. A Guerra na lírica de Arquíloco*, 2. Ed. revista e ampliada, São Paulo 2009
- D.: E. Diehl (ed.), *Anthologia Lyrica Graeca. Fasc. 3. Iamborum Scriptores*, Leipzig 1952<sup>3</sup>
- DGE: F. Adrados, ed. *Diccionario griego-español*, Madrid 1989-
- D.-K.: H. Diels – W. Kranz (eds.), *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*, Zürich – Hildesheim 1992<sup>19</sup>, I-II
- Davison 1954: J. A. Davison, review of Diehl 1952, in "Journal of Hellenic Studies" 74 (1954), p. 193
- Davison 1960: J. A. Davison, *Archilochus fr. 2 Diehl*, "Classical Review", New Series, 10 (1960), pp. 1-4.
- Del Grande 1959<sup>3</sup>: C. Del Grande, *ΦΟΡΜΙΓΞ. Antologia della lirica greca*, Napoli 1959<sup>3</sup>
- Edmonds 1931: L. M. Edmonds, *Greek Elegy and Iambus*, I-III, Cambridge, Mass. – London, England 1931
- Ehrenberg 1962: V. Ehrenberg, *Archilochus, frag. 2 D*, "Classical Philology" 57 (1962), pp. 239-240
- Felson Rubin 1981: N. Felson Rubin, *Radical Semantic Shifts in Archilochus*, "Classical Journal" 77 (1981), pp. 1-8

- Ferrari 1995: F. Ferrari, *L'Alfabeto delle Muse. Storia e testi della letteratura greca*, I, Bologna 1995
- Ferrari 2000: F. Ferrari, *La porta dei canti. Storia e antologia della lirica greca*, Bologna 2000
- Fränkel 1993<sup>4</sup>: H. Fränkel, *Dichtung und Philosophie des frühen Griechentums: eine Geschichte der griechischen Epik, Lyrik und Prosa bis zur Mitte des fünften Jahrhunderts*, München 1993<sup>4</sup>
- Gentili 1965: B. Gentili, *Interpretazione di Archiloco fr. 2 D.=7 L.–B.*, “Rivista di filologia e di istruzione classica” 43 (1965), pp. 129-134
- Gentili 1970: B. Gentili, *La lancia di Archiloco e le figurazioni vascolari*, in *Studia Florentina Alexandro Ronconi sexagenario oblata*, Roma, pp. 115-120
- Gentili 1976: B. Gentili, *Nota ad Archiloco, P. Col. 7511; Fr. 2 Tard., 2 West*, “Quaderni urbinati di cultura classica” 21 (1976), pp. 17-21
- Gentili – Catenacci 2007: B. Gentili – C. Catenacci, *Polinnia. Poesia greca arcaica*, Messina – Firenze 2007
- Gerber 1970: D. E. Gerber, *Euterpe: An Anthology of Early Greek Lyric, Elegiac, and Iambic Poetry*, Amsterdam 1970
- Giangrande 1972: G. Giangrande, *Archiloque au pilori*, “Quaderni urbinati di cultura classica” 14 (1972), pp. 37-40
- Giannini 1988: P. Giannini, *Il 'convito' di Archiloco (fr. 2 e 7 T. = 2 e 4 W.)*, “Rudiae” 1 (1988), pp. 31-44
- Gulick 1971<sup>4</sup>: C. B. Gulick (ed.), *Athenaeus, The Deipnosophists. I-VII*, London, England – Cambridge, Mass. 1969 – 1971<sup>4</sup>
- Heitsch 1964: E. Heitsch, *ΤΑΗΜΟΣΥΝΗ*, “Hermes” 92 (1964), pp. 257-264

- Hudson-Williams 1926: T. Hudson-Williams, *Early Greek Elegy*, Cardiff 1926
- Inglese – Bongiorno 2013: L. Inglese – A. Bongiorno (eds.), *Archiloco, Frammenti*, Borgomanero 2013
- Katsonopoulou – Petropoulos – Katsarou 2008: D. Katsonopoulou – I. Petropoulos – S. Katsarou (eds.), *Archilochos and His Age. Proceedings of the Second International Conference on the Archaeology of Paros and the Cyclades*, Paroikia, Paros (7-9 Oct. 2005), Athens 2008
- Krause 1976: J. Krause, *ΑΛΛΟΤΕ ΑΛΛΩΣ. Untersuchungen zum Motiv des Schicksalswechsels in der griechischen Dichtung bis Euripides*, München 1976
- L.-S.-J.: H. G. Liddell – R. Scott – H. S. Jones, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, Oxford 1983<sup>22</sup>
- Lasserre 1979: F. Lasserre, *Archiloque frg. 2 West*, “Grazer Beiträge” 8 (1979), pp. 49-56
- Lasserre – Bonnard 1958: F. Lasserre – A. Bonnard A. (eds.), *Archiloque, Fragments*, Paris 1958
- Lavelle 2008: B. M. Lavelle, *The Servant of Enyalios*, in Katsonopoulou – Petropoulos – Katsarou 2008, pp. 145-161
- Lennartz 2010: K. Lennartz, *Iambos: philologische Untersuchungen zur Geschichte einer Gattung in der Antike*, Wiesbaden 2010
- Liebel 1818: I. Liebel (ed.), *Archilochi iambographorum principis reliquiae, Editio secunda, retractata et novis quibusdam fragmentis aucta*, Vindobonae 1818
- Lloyd-Jones 1996: H. Lloyd-Jones (ed.), *Sophocles, Fragments*, Cambridge, Mass. – London, England 1996

- Marzullo 1965: B. Marzullo, *Frammenti della lirica greca*, [Firenze] 1965
- Mazon 1972<sup>8</sup>: P. Mazon (ed.), Hésiode, *Théogonie, Les Travaux et les Jours, Le Bouclier*, Paris 1972<sup>8</sup>
- Merone 1960: E. Merone, *Aggettivazione, sintassi e figure di stile in Archiloco*, Napoli 1960
- Mingazzini 1967: P. Mingazzini, *Spigolature vascolari*, “Annuario della Scuola Archeologica di Atene e delle Missioni Italiane in Oriente” 45 (1967), pp. 327-353
- Monaco 1960: G. Monaco, *Nota archilochea*, “Atene e Roma”, N. S., 5 (1960), pp. 19-22
- Montgomery 1990: J. E. Montgomery, *A Reconsideration of Some Jahili Poetic Paradigms*, PhD Thesis, Univ. of Glasgow, 1990 (<http://theses.gla.ac.uk/1850/>)
- Murray 1994: O. Murray, *Nestor's Cup and the Origins of the Greek Symposion*, “AION (archeol.)” 1 (1994), pp. 47-54
- Musti 2001: D. Musti, *Il simposio nel suo sviluppo storico*, Roma – Bari 2001
- Nicolosi 2005: A. Nicolosi, *La frustrazione del guerriero in armi ovvero il simposio negato (Archil. fr. 2 W.<sup>2</sup>)*, “Prometheus” 31 (2005), pp. 35-40
- Nicolosi 2007: A. Nicolosi, *Ipponatte, Epodi di Strasburgo. Archiloco, Epodi di Colonia. Con un'Appendice su P.Oxy LIX 4708*, Bologna 2007
- Nicolosi 2013: A. Nicolosi (ed.), *Archiloco, Elegie*, Bologna 2013
- Nikolaev 2014: A. Nikolaev, *An Epic Party? Sober Thoughts on νηφήμεν (Archil. fr. 4 W.<sup>2</sup>)*, “Philologus” 58 (2014), pp. 10-25



- OCD: S. Hornblower – A. Spawforth – E. Eidinow (eds.), *Oxford Classical Dictionary*, Oxford 2012<sup>4</sup>
- Ornaghi 2009: M. Ornaghi, *La lira, la vacca e le donne insolenti. Contesti di ricezione e promozione della figura e della poesia di Archiloco dall'arcaismo all'ellenismo*, Alessandria 2009
- Paduano 1990: G. Paduano, *Antologia della letteratura greca. I. Il periodo ionico*, Bologna 1990
- Page 1964: D. Page, *Archilochus and the Oral Tradition*, in J. Poilloux *et al.* 1964, pp. 117-179
- Page 1982<sup>3</sup>: D. Page (ed.), *Aeschyli septem quae supersunt tragoediae*, Oxonii 1982<sup>3</sup>
- Page 1983<sup>4</sup>: D. Page (ed.), *Poetae Melici Graeci*, Oxonii 1983<sup>4</sup>
- Paleothodoros 2012: D. Paleothodoros, *Dionysus and the Tyrrhenian Pirates*, in V. Bellelli (ed.), *Le origini degli Etruschi. Storia, archeologia, antropologia*, Roma 2012, pp. 455-485
- Pavese 1995: C. O. Pavese, *Arch. 2 T. = 2 W. év δοπί*, in L. Belloni – G. Milanese – A. Porro (eds.), *Studia classica Iohanni Tarditi oblata*, Milano 1995, I, pp. 335-340
- Pearson 1917: A. C. Pearson (ed.), *The Fragments of Sophocles*, I-III, Cambridge 1917
- Perotti 1985: P. A. Perotti, *Archiloco fr. 2 D.*, “Giornale italiano di filologia” 16 (1985), pp. 223-231
- Pocock 1961: L. G. Pocock, *Archilochus Fr. 2*, “Classical Review”, New Series, 11 (1961), 179-180
- Podlecki 1984: A. J. Podlecki, *The Early Greek Poets and Their Times*, Vancouver 1984
- Poilloux *et al.* 1964: J. Pouilloux – N. M. Kontoleon – A. Scherer – K. J. Dover – D. Page – W. Bühler – E. Wistrand – B. Snell – O.

Reverdin – M. Treu, *Archiloque*, Entretiens sur l'Antiquité Classique, X, Vandoeuvres–Genève (26 Août – 3 Septembre 1963), Genève, Fondation Hardt, 1964

Pontani 1969: F. M. Pontani, *I lirici greci*, Torino 1969

Radt 1977: S. Radt (ed.), *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta. 4. Sophocles*, Göttingen 1977

Rankin 1972: H. D. Rankin, *Archilochus fg. 2 D, fg. 7 L.–B.*, “Emerita” 40 (1972), pp. 469-474

Renahan 1983: R. Renahan, *The Early Greek Poets: Some Interpretations*, “Harvard Studies in Classical Philology” 87 (1983), pp. 1-29

Riu 2008: X. Riu, *On the Difference between Praise and Inveective*, in Katsonopoulou – Petropoulos – Katsarou 2008, pp. 81-90

Romagnoli 1936: E. Romagnoli, *I poeti lirici V*, Bologna 1936

Rösler 1976: W. Rösler, *Die Dichtung des Archilochos und die neue Kölner Epode*, “Rheinisches Museum” 119 (1976), pp. 289-310

Russo 1974: J. Russo, *The Inner Man in Archilochus and the Odyssey*, “Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies” 15 (1974), pp. 139-152

Scherer 1964: A. Scherer, *Die Sprache des Archilochos*, in J. Poilloux *et al.* 1964, pp. 87-116

Schuchhardt 1969: W. H. Schuchhardt, *Archäologisches zu Archilochos*, in P. Zazoff (ed.), *Opus Nobile. Festschrift zum 60. Geburtstag von Ulf Jantzen*, Wiesbaden, pp. 153-155

Seidensticker 1978: B. Seidensticker, *Archilochus and Odysseus*, “Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies” 19 (1978), pp. 5-22

Snell 1953: B. Snell, *The Discovery of the Mind. The Greek Origins of European Thought*, transl. by T. G. Rosenmeyer, Cambridge, Mass. 1953

- Stanford 1954: W. B. Stanford, *The Ulysses Theme: A Study in the Adaptability of a Traditional Hero*, Oxford 1954
- Steiner 2012: D. Steiner, *Drowning Sorrows: Archilochus fr. 13 W. in its Performance Context*, “Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies” 52 (2012), pp. 21-56
- Sulliger 1962: J. Sulliger, *Un nouvel Archiloque. A propos d’une édition récente*, “Études de lettres” 5 (1962), pp. 29-36
- Swift 2012: L. A. Swift, *Archilochus the ‘Anti-Hero’? Heroism, Flight and Values in Homer and the New Archilochus Fragment (P.Oxy LXIX, 4708)*, “Journal of Hellenic Studies” 132 (2012), pp. 139-155
- T.: G. Tarditi (ed.), *Archilochus*, Romae 1968
- Tedeschi in <https://units.academia.edu/gennarotedeschi>: G. Tedeschi, *Il canto di Hybrias cretese: un esempio di poesia conviviale* — this is an updated version of a paper originally published in “Quaderni di filologia classica dell’Università di Trieste” 5 (1986), pp. 55-59
- Theunissen 1953: M. Theunissen, *A propos des fragments 2 et 6 (Diehl) d’Archiloque*, “L’Antiquité classique” 22 (1953), pp. 406-411
- Treloar 1979: A. Treloar, *The Greek Spear: Archilochus Fr. 2 Diehl*, “Prudentia” 11 (1979), pp. 33-35
- Van Groningen 1930: B. A. Van Groningen, *De Archilochi fragmento secundo*, “Mnemosyne” 58 (1930), pp. 74-78
- Usener 1887: H. Usener (ed.), *Epicurea*, Lipsiae 1887
- Vetta 1999: M. Vetta, *ΣΥΜΠΟΣΙΟΝ. Antologia della lirica greca*. Napoli 1999
- W.: M. L. West (ed.) *Iambi et Elegi Graeci ante Alexandrum cantati. Editio altera aucta atque emendata*, I, Oxonii 1989

- West 1974: M. L. West, *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus*, Berlin – New York 1974
- West 1978: M. L. West (ed.), Hesiod, *Works and Days*, Oxford 1978
- West 1993: M. L. West, *Greek Lyric Poetry. The poems and fragments of the Greek iambic, elegiac, and melic poets (excluding Pindar and Bacchylides) down to 450 BC translated*, Oxford 1993
- Węcowski 2002: M. Węcowski, *Homer and the Origins of the Symposion*, in F. Montanari (ed.), *Omero tremila anni dopo*, Roma 2002, pp. 625-637
- Węcowski 2010–2012: M. Węcowski, *When Did the Symposion Rise? Some Archaeological Considerations Regarding the Emergence of the Greek Aristocratic Banquet*, “*Αρχαιολογία*” 16 (2010-2012), pp. 19-48