

THE SHIP, THE WATCH,
AND THE SYMPOSIUM: ARCHILOCHUS'
FRAGMENTS 2 AND 4 W.^{2*}

Abstract: The present article is a full-length re-examination of Archilochus' fr. 2 and 4 W. In the first place, it shows that there is no compelling reason for assigning both fragments to a single elegy composed or performed during a night-time watch on a ship, as many scholars assume; in the second place, it offers a metasymptotic reading of both fragments. In fr. 4 Archilochus uses marine and military imagery to conjure up a fictional setting that evokes the actual sympotic gathering.

Keywords: Archilochus, symposium, deixis, performance

Of the elegies of Archilochus only a scant number of fragments remains. These are nevertheless sufficient to offer a good example of the variety of subjects and subtleties that elegiac poetry of the archaic age lent itself to express. Pain for the loss of a companion (cf. fr. 8–13 W[est]²) alternates with scenes of military life (fr. 2–6 W.²), while nods to the moment in which wine plays its part are not lacking either (fr. 2 and 4 W.²). At least in part, one can already glimpse the profile of the wine-inspired poet which would become famous in the centuries to come, although no space is yet given to the 'base' tones that his iambs at times take on.¹ Much here has the taste of casualness and the impromptu, and the temptation to see Archilochus as a poet of immediacy, marked by an expressive vigor free from mediations, has been a very attractive point of view for critics of the past. A large number of Archilochus' elegies, especially those more reduced in length, can be contextualized

*) I would like to thank C. Meliadò and H. Spelman for reading and commenting on an earlier draft of this paper. Any remaining errors and all the views expressed in this paper are my own.

1) For Archilochus the harsh-tongued, inebriated poet, see e.g. Callimachus' fr. 380 (εἴλκυσε δὲ δριμύν τε χόλον κυνὸς ὄξύ τε κέντρον / σφηκός, ἀπ' ἀμφοτέρων δ' ἰὸν ἔχει στόματος) and 544 Pf. (τοῦ < > μεθυπλήγος φροίμιον Ἀρχιλόχου) or Antipater of Thessalonica's epigram AP 11,20 = 20 Gow-Page (GPh 185–90). See Degani 1973; Di Marco 2010.

within the principally aristocratic sphere of social and cultural interaction that is the symposium.² In the archaic symposium, which, at the time of Archilochus (ca. mid-VII century BCE), already showed the characteristics of a relatively mature practice,³ the communal aspect is that which prevails: participants form part of a group within their city which consolidates its own identity through ritual and song. Poetry therefore amounts to a fundamental element of social and cultural cohesion: the ‘I’ which at times emerges explicitly in these compositions can be identified firstly with the audience of the poet’s companions, but also with all those who will perform that same song in another time and place: in the symposium much is shared, shareable, and available to be performed repeatedly as desired.⁴ From this point of view, the way in which we conceptualize the circumstance, execution, and meaning of an archaic poetic text may be less obvious than it appears at first glance.⁵ This is, I believe, the case of Archilochus’ fr. 2 and 4 W.² = 2 and

2) See Gentili 1969; Rösler 1980; Vetta 1983; Bowie 1986; Murray 1990; Slater 1991; Gentili 1995; Davidson 1997; Stehle 1997, 212–61; Catoni 2010; Hobden 2013; Wecowski 2014; Cazzato / Obbink / Prodi 2016.

3) Wecowski 2014 has recently argued that the institution of the symposium emerged in the first half of the VIII century BCE or even two generations earlier. A similar hypothesis (mid-VIII century BCE) had already been put forward by Murray 1994 (I owe this reference to C. Malacrino). See also Catoni 2010, 64–70; Wecowski 2010–12; cf. Dentzer 1982, 429–30 (introduction of the “orientalizing” symposium around the late VII cent.). For the chronology of Archilochus, in addition to the greatly detailed study by Graham 1978, 72–86, who places him around 650 BCE, see Blakeway 1936 (early VII cent.); Jacoby 1941 = 1961, 249–67 (c. 680–640); Gentili 1982, 9–10 n. 11 = 1995, 241 n. 11 (*floruit* not later than 660); Lavelle 2002. For more general information on the early history of the tradition of Ionian elegy see Dover 1964, 190–94 (with no mention, however, of the symposium and its interpretive relevance); D’Alessio 2009, 120–28.

4) There is also, however, a wider perspective within which the composition of the archaic elegy can be placed. As early as 1986, E. L. Bowie had claimed in a seminal study that narrative elegies of considerable length composed during the archaic age were intended for performance in competition at public festivals. The 1992 publication of papyrus fragments of elegiac poems by Simonides on the battles of Plataea and Artemisium (POxy 3965, fr. 1–4, 10–17 W.²), and, more recently, the publication of Archilochus’ elegiac narrative of Telephus’ rout of the Achaeans (POxy LXIX 4708), have offered new elements with which the wider problem of the performance of archaic elegies, and, in particular, the elegies of Archilochus, can be reconsidered; see e.g. Aloni 2001; Bowie 2016. For the possibility that Archil. fr. 1 W.² was also intended for a more ‘public’ performance, see Aloni 1981, 31–49 (perhaps reading too much into this distich, however).

5) Cf. e.g. the case of Archil. fr. 13 W.² discussed in Steiner 2012.

7 T(arditi). Several critics believe that these fragments belong to a single elegy and that they illustrate a true “symposium of war”.⁶

1. *Two fragments of a single elegy?*

The first fragment which we will discuss (fr. 2 W.²) can be considered a synthesis of Archilochus’ vocation:

ἐν δορὶ μὲν μοι μᾶζα μεμαγμένη, ἐν δορὶ δ’ οἶνος
Ἴσμαρικός· πίνω δ’ ἐν δορὶ κεκλιμένος

In this famous distich two images are juxtaposed which the poet seems to have drawn from the horizon of his own everyday life: the spear – according to the widespread interpretation of the phrase ἐν δορὶ, to which I shall soon return –, a flatbread, and the wine of Ismarus, a wine which was therefore produced in Thrace, where our poet was engaged militarily as part of a colonial pursuit. The fragment almost seems to translate, in a more concrete, accurate perspective, the essence of the poetics of Archilochus, who, in another equally famous fragment, proclaims himself “servant of lord Enyalios and skilled in the lovely gift of the Muses” (fr. 1 W.² = 1 T., trans. by D. E. Gerber).

The precise interpretation of fr. 2 W.² has proven to be less obvious than a mere surface reading might indicate. Critics in the 1950s and ’60s called attention to several aporiae in the distich’s most commonly accepted interpretation.⁷ In 1965, and on various other occasions in the years to follow, B. Gentili proposed a radically innovative exegetic solution founded primarily on the interpretation of the phrase ἐν δορὶ. In his interpretation this phrase must have the same meaning in all three instances in which it is used within the distich and cannot mean, in the last of these, “(leaning) on the spear”, according to the most common exegesis.⁸ What is its

6) “Un simposio di guerra” is the title with which these fragments are presented in De Martino and Vox 1996, II 592–4.

7) For several detailed reviews of the relevant bibliography see Arnould 1980; Bossi 1990, 67–76; Gerber 1993, 51–6.

8) Gentili 1965. For the interpretation of δόρυ as “spear” see e.g. Lasserre and Bonnard 1958, 3; Tarditi 1968, 60.

exact meaning? Gentili discusses the context in which Archilochus' fragment is quoted in Synesius' Epistle 130 Garzya-Roques.⁹ Cyrene is besieged by barbarians and the bishop himself is forced to endure long shifts on the city's night watch; he quotes from Archilochus to highlight the fact that the archaic poet and Synesius find themselves in a similar situation. Hence Gentili's conclusion that Archilochus, like Synesius, was indeed referring to a night-time φυλακή. Among Archilochus' elegiac fragments there is in fact a fragment which explicitly refers to a watch spent together with some companions, fr. 4 W.² (= 7 T.). The fragment in question is a small scrap of papyrus datable to the late II century CE (POxy VI 854), in part supplemented from the citation of vv. 6–9 in Athenaeus (Ἀρχίλοχος ἐν ἐλεγείοις, 11,66, 483d):¹⁰

9) The fragment is also cited by Athen. 1,56, 30f; two other citations in the Suda depend upon Synesius (s.vv. Ἰσαμαρικὸς οἶνος, τ 645 A.; ὑπνομαχῶ, υ 441 A.).

10) The papyrus fragment is conserved in the Toledo Museum of Art, Ohio (inv. 1915/23 recto). It should be noted that POxy VI 854, XXX 2507 (= Adesp. eleg. 61 W.², elegiacs hesitantly ascribed by Lobel to Archilochus), and LXIX 4708 (Archilochus' 'new' elegy on Telephus and smaller fragments) belong to the same roll (same hand, line-spacing, and format; LDAB 327/MP³ 122). The hand was identified by Henry 1998 (see Obbink 2005, 19 and 2006, 1–2), who also offered further refinements on published readings and supplements regarding POxy VI 854. The text presented here includes the revisions made by W. B. Henry; I was able to check them against a high quality digital reproduction of the papyrus provided to me with great courtesy by Dr. Julia M. Hayes (Toledo Museum of Art), to whom I give my most sincere thanks. A reading that deserves particular consideration is νήφονες (9), which accounts for the traces on the papyrus much better than West's reading, νηφῆμεν, which has been adopted by the most recent editors (Nicolosi 2013 and 2017; see also Nikolaev 2014). On the basis of my inspection of the digital reproduction, I am confident in saying that, in v. 9, the three letters at the beginning of the verse are most certainly legible (NHΦ). The fifth, as noted by Henry, is without a doubt a nu. As for the preceding traces, there is not enough room for ξ[ι], as claimed by the editors Grenfell and Hunt (compare the space occupied by the two letters in vv. 3 and 8); instead, the traces are compatible with a small-sized omicron (pace Grenfell and Hunt, who exclude this possibility). The second omicron in v. 5 is quite similar in size and shape. It is extremely probable that the sixth letter is an epsilon: the curved stroke is mostly visible and the horizontal stroke is sufficiently distinct. The last letter – here too I concur with Henry – is rounded, and two strokes can be discerned: one, on the left, reasonably broad, and the other, on the right, little more than a dot; sigma seems most compatible with these traces. If one accepts the reading νήφονες, the elegy cannot conclude with v. 9: in the following verses there must have been an infinitive governed by δυνήσομεθα. As regards the adjective νήφων, -ov, this is attested with certainty elsewhere (i. e. with a clear distinction from the much more common present participle of the verb νήφω) only in Theogn. 481

clude with fr. 2, i. e. “una semplice razione di pane, allietata però da un ottimo vino che renderà più tollerabile la fatica di stare in vedetta”. Fr. 2 therefore describes “con efficace realismo ed energica personale intonazione una delle consuete vicende della vita in mare”. A few years later, Gentili would return to the matter to reiterate and, in part, broaden his argument, concluding with an iconographic parallel: Dionysus aboard a ship on the well-known cup by the painter Exekias – the god appears reclining, with his left elbow leaning against the bridge and his right hand holding a great horn full of wine – mirrors Archilochus’ position as described in fr. 2.¹²

This reading has enjoyed considerable favour amongst critics.¹³ However, its fundamental premise – the hypothesis that fr. 2 and 4 W.² belong to the same elegy – does not appear fully justified by a closer analysis of the passage in which Synesius cites Archilochus’ fr. 2.¹⁴ The passage deserves to be quoted in full (Epist. 130,22–39):

Αἰσθάνομαι γιγνόμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ πάθους ἔκφορος, ἀλλὰ συγγνώσῃ.
 Τειχίρης γάρ εἰμι καὶ πολιορκούμενος γράφω, τῆς ὥρας πολλάκις
 φρυκτοῦς ὄρων καὶ αὐτοὺς ἀνάπτων καὶ αὐτὸς καὶ αἴρων τοῖς ἄλλοις
 σημεῖα, κυνηγέσια δὲ ἐκεῖνα τὰ πρόσω κατανομῶν οἷς ἐπ’ ἐξουσίας
 ἐχρῶμεθα πρότερον οὐχ ἥκιστα διὰ σέ, πάντα ἔρρει· καὶ στένομεν με-
 μνημένοι

12) Gentili 1970, 120. On Exekias’ cup see below (p. 267).

13) See Gentili and Catenacci 2007, 85, where the scholars say that fr. 2 “almost certainly belonged to the same elegy” to which fr. 4 belonged; see also Perrotta and Gentili 1965, 65–6; Gentili 1976. Those in favour of the two fragments belonging to a single elegy include Vetta 1983a, XIV–XVI; Perotti 1985; Tedeschi 1986; De Martino and Vox 1996, II 592–4; Aloni and Iannucci 2007, 121; see also Bahntje 1900, 11 n. 28; Bowra 1954, 43 (cf. Davison 1960, 3); Ehrenberg 1962; Russo 1973–4, 714; Aloni 1981, 49–59; Gerber 1999, 79; Bossi 1990, 67–76; Steiner 2012, 41–2. Treu 1959, 191 cites fr. 2 in relation to fr. 4. Diehl 1952, 2 suggests that his fr. 2, 5a, 5b, 11, and 12 (respectively 2, 4, 46, 12, and 8 W.²) might belong to the same poem. Giannini 1988 believes that the two fragments show a “modulo espressivo analogo” and that they could derive from two distinct poems. Gerber 1999, 79, who does not seem to place great faith in the association between the two fragments, does accept Gentili’s translation of fr. 2, which, in any event, presupposes such an association. F. Bossi (1980, 25–6; see also 1990, 74), furthermore, believes that the allusion in Theocr. 7,63–70 to both fragments is a clue in favour of the possibility that “essi fossero vicini: anche per questo, i fr. 2 e 4 di Archiloco doverano far parte del medesimo componimento”; however, the only reference to fr. 4 would be the echo ἐς τρύγα (Theocr. 7,70) ~ ἀπὸ τρυγός (fr. 4,8), perhaps a bit flimsy to support the deduction founded upon it.

14) The value of Synesius’ epistle for the critical interpretation of Archilochus has recently been brought to the fore by Nicolosi 2005; see also Burzacchini 2012.

ἤβης τ' ἐκείνης νοῦ τ' ἐκείνου καὶ φρενῶν (Eupol. Δῆμοι, fr. 99,48 K.-A. = 17,48 Telò).

Ἄλλ' ἵπποκροτεῖται μὲν νῦν ἅπαντα καὶ τὴν χώραν ἔχουσιν οἱ πολέμοιοι, ἐγὼ δὲ ὑπὸ μεσοπυργίῳ τεταγμένος ὑπνομαχῶ.

ἐν δορὶ μὲν μοι μᾶζα μεμαγμένη, ἐν δορὶ δ' οἶνος
Ἴσμαρικός, πίνω δ' ἐν δορὶ κεκλιμένος.

οὐκ οἶδ' εἰ μᾶλλον Ἀρχιλόχῳ προσήκοντα ἦν ταῦτα εἰπεῖν. Κακὸς κακῶς ἀπόλοιτο Κερέαλιος εἰ μὴ καὶ προαπόλωλε τῆς ἀρᾶς ὡς ἄξιός γε ἦν ἔργον γεγενῆσθαι τοῦ πρώην χειμῶνος: ὅς ἐπειδὴ τὴν χώραν εἶδεν ἐν ᾧ κινδύνου κατέστησεν, ἠπίστησε καθάπαξ τῇ γῆ καὶ, τὸ χρυσίον ἐνθεις διααρμένοις δλκάσιν, ἐπὶ μετεώρου σαλεύει.¹⁵

The addressee of the epistle is Simplicius, a prominent figure in the Constantinople of his day, while the context is that of the invasions carried out by the nomadic populations who had penetrated into the Pentapolis as far as the city of Cyrene; the date, confirmed by the information provided by Synesius himself, is 405 AD. In his letter he dwells upon the unacceptable behavior of Cerialis, *dux Libyarum* on behalf of the empire.¹⁶ Against all expectations, including those of Synesius himself, Cerialis had become responsible for a series of terrible decisions in both the political and military fields, to the point of facilitating, instead of discouraging, barbarian incursions against Cyrene. Synesius is engaged on the front line against the enemy by order of Cerialis: he in fact writes from the walls of the city under siege (Τειχήρης γάρ εἰμι καὶ πολιορκούμενος γράφω and τὴν χώραν ἔχουσιν οἱ πολέμοιοι), constrained to arduous turns on watch (φρυκτοὺς ὄρων; ἐγὼ δὲ ὑπὸ μεσοπυργίῳ τεταγμένος ὑπνομαχῶ), made all the more desolate by the memory of moments of serenity once shared with Simplicius.

The citation of Archilochus' fr. 2 W.² is inserted precisely between Synesius' description of his current state, as night watchman on guard amongst the towers of the city walls, fighting against sleep (ἐγὼ δὲ ὑπὸ μεσοπυργίῳ τεταγμένος ὑπνομαχῶ), and the reference to Cerialis, to whom the ἀρά which immediately follows is addressed (Κακὸς κακῶς ἀπόλοιτο κτλ.). Within the discourse developed throughout the letter, the citation of Archilochus proves functional and efficacious insofar as it reflects Synesius' situation,

15) For the text I follow the edition of Garzya and Roques 2003.

16) Seeck 1899.

burdened as he is with nearly uninterrupted watch duty. However, the precision with which Synesius describes the nocturnal setting of his labouring – the fight against sleep (ὑπνομαχῶ), the torches that shine several times each hour and which he himself lights to send signals to his companions (τῆς ὥρας πολλακίς φρυκτοὺς ὀρῶν, καὶ αὐτοὺς ἀνάπτων καὶ αὐτὸς καὶ αἴρων τοῖς ἄλλοις σημεῖα) – finds no correspondence in Archilochus’ fr. 2. Instead, these details serve to intensify the dramatic tenor of Synesius’ account. The crucial element in the citation of the poet from Paros resides in the anaphor of the phrase ἐν δορί, which, from Synesius’ point of view, manages to adequately convey the laborious protraction of a corvée imposed by a general useless in war and oppressive in times of peace (ἀπόλεμος, ἐν εἰρήνῃ βαρὺς, as is affirmed at the beginning of the letter).¹⁷ Archilochus’ fr. 2 does not depict a moment of respite between one watch shift and the next, as claimed by Gentili, since Synesius draws upon the fragment precisely to illustrate his nearly total deprivation of any moment of relief;¹⁸ nor does it seem necessary to invoke a naval context for Archilochus’ distich. Moreover, it appears clear that the citation – a rhetorical expedient of which the author makes use various times in his letter¹⁹ – does not presuppose a wider narrative context in Archilochus, but it is

17) It comes as no surprise that Synesius here takes inspiration from Archilochus, whom he considered ὁ κάλλιστος ποιητῶν in his *Calvitii encomium* (11,4 Lamoreux).

18) I do not believe that Lasserre 1979, 52 is correct in stating that Archilochus is cited to illustrate the contrast between past and present, as Synesius underscores earlier in his epistle (κυνηγέσια δὲ ἐκεῖνα . . . πάντα ἔρρει). I in fact find it difficult to believe that the distich could bring forth, in the context of the epistle, an “évocation des joies inaccessibles”.

19) On this see Burzacchini 2012. As Burzacchini points out, Synesius in fact cites Od. 9,51 first, and then, shortly thereafter, adds an Aeschylean touch with στένομεν μεμνημένοι (cf. στένο μεμνημένος at Pers. 285). He then references an iambic trimeter taken from Eupolis’ *Demoi* (ἦβης τ’ ἐκείνης νοῦ τ’ ἐκείνου καὶ φρεῶν, 99,48 K.-A. = 17,48 Telò), imitation of a verse from Cratinus’ *Εὐνεῖδαι* (ἦβης ἐκείνης, νοῦ δὲ τοῦδε καὶ φρεῶν, fr. 71 K.-A.) preserved by Stobaeus (4,11,11) in the section περὶ νεότητος; the verse by Eupolis, cited by the emperor Julian as well (Misop. 4, p. 339 D.), is therefore anything but a “trimetro altrimenti ignoto” (Garzya 1989, 315 n. 8). In general, on the literary dimension of Synesius’ epistles see Roques 1989; Garzya / Roques 2003a, L–LXX; Hose 2003. Garzya 1958 = 1963 claimed that Epist. 45 Garzya / Roques offers a “variazione, quasi un rifacimento” (p. 161 n. 4) of Archilochus’ fr. 4 W²; in any event, similarities between the two passages do not seem very strong.

in itself fully intelligible within the description laid out by the late antique man of letters.

In conclusion, Synesius does not cite the distich in its quality as a description of a nocturnal φυλακή similar to his own but, rather, because it can be read in relation to a military engagement without respite, like the one imposed by Cerialis. The close association with fr. 4 W.² cannot, therefore, be maintained, and the probability that both fragments belong to the same elegy becomes rather remote, or at the very least, not adequately supported by the data in our possession.²⁰

2. Fr. 2 W.²: a failed symposium?

According to the traditional interpretation of fr. 2 W.², Archilochus describes himself while drinking and leaning on his spear. The linguistic premise on which this interpretation is based is that the syntagm ἐν δορί is strictly dependent upon the participle κεκλιμένος.²¹ Gentili, however, objects that in the sense ‘to lean’ or ‘to be leaning’, the verb κλίνω / κλίνομαι requires the simple dative or πρὸς and the accusative, never ἐν with the dative.²² On the other hand, ἐν δορί cannot have a meaning in v. 2 which is radically different from the phrase’s meaning in v. 1, lest the anaphor that informs the entire distich lose its effectiveness.²³ The hypothesis

20) Lasserre 1979, 52–3 is also skeptical regarding the association between the two fragments, albeit for reasons rather different from those put forward here; doubts also in Gerber 1981, 11 n. 5; Nicolosi 2005, 35–7; Burzacchini 2012, 161–3. The idea that fr. 2 W.² is a complete poem is supported, among others, by Davison 1960, 4; Murray 1994, 53; contra Rankin 1972, who believes it to be the introduction to a skolion; see also Clay 2004, 50: “These lines probably come from a drinking song (skolion) and were meant to be capped by two lines of improvisation delivered by another member of the symposium.”

21) Pasquali 1935, 92 (“In cima alla lancia . . . bevo poggiato alla lancia”); Gigante 1958, 50 and 51 (“non si sdraia per bere, ma si appoggia alla lancia”); Lasserre and Bonnard 1958, 3; Treu 1959, 23; Tarditi 1968, 60; Mingazzini 1969, 334; Felson Rubin 1981, 7; LSJ⁹ s.v. κλίνω II 2 (“lean, stay oneself upon or against a thing”, with reference to Il. 3,135 ἀσπίσι κεκλιμένοι; Od. 6,307 κίονι κεκλιμένη, 17,97 κλισμῶ κεκλιμένη).

22) Gentili 1965, 130 (already noted by Bowra 1954, 38); see also Gentili 1970, 117–8. For instances of ἐν + dat. in Archilochus see Gentili 1965, 130 n. 2.

23) This point was underlined by Bowra 1954, 37–8; see also van Groningen 1930, 76; Davison 1960; Ehrenberg 1962; Gentili 1965, 130, 134.

that fr. 2 and 4 W.² belonged to the same elegy allowed Gentili to reach the conclusion that the phrase δόρυ corresponded to “wood, plank, beam of the ship”.²⁴ This hypothesis, though, is implausible, as we now know, and our interpretation needs to rely on more intrinsic criteria, i. e. the syntactic structure and referential content of the couplet.

From a syntactic point of view, fr. 2 W.² is, of course, modulated by the triple anaphor of the syntagm ἐν δορί. This modulation is not, however, homogenous, and critics have not always grasped the peculiarity of the distich. D. L. Page, who deemed it quite traditional in terms of formular diction – “there is nothing that could not be said in the same or similar terms by a Hector to a Paris”, he added²⁵ –, found a Homeric antecedent for the anaphor in Il. 17,430–31 (πολλὰ μὲν ἄρ μάστιγι θοῆ ἔπεμαίετο θείνων, / πολλὰ δὲ μελιχίοισι προσηύδα, πολλὰ δ’ ἄρειῆ). As a matter of fact, the Iliadic passage does not fully account for our fragment’s syntax. In Homer’s verses there is a clear progression of gradually shorter cola with a substantially uniform syntactic structure. This uniformity is marked by the repetition of adverbial πολλά followed by the instrumental datives μάστιγι θοῆ, μελιχίοισι, and ἄρειῆ. In Archilochus the articulation is instead markedly less homogenous. Of the three syntactic cola which make up the distich, the first two are for all intents and purposes symmetrical. These are two brief nominal sentences in which the syntagm ἐν δορί is located at the beginning, the first person singular pronoun appears in the dative, and the verb ‘to be’ is implied. But what do these lines specifically refer to? They are certainly not referring to just any wine but to the wine of Ismarus, a city in Thrace not too far from

24) Gentili 1965, 133. Davison 1960 had already claimed that δόρυ might here indicate the ship (without taking into account the context in which Synesius cites the fragment, though). Gentili 1965, 130 objects to Davison that this meaning of the term is not attested earlier than Bacchylides (Dith. 17,90 M.) and that “ancora nel 462 Pindaro, nella *Pitica* 4,27, per designare con δόρυ la nave, sentiva la necessità di aggiungere il qualificativo ἐννάλιον” (see Braswell 1988, 103). Yet once he posits that fr. 2 and 4 W.² belong to the same elegy, his conclusions are not very different: “nulla impedisce che qui δόρυ abbia il suo primo significato di legno, ovvero di legno, tavola, trave della nave secondo il normale uso omerico di δόρυ νηϊον; il qualificativo νηϊον è ovviamente omissso perché non necessario in un contesto dove il riferimento alla nave era reso esplicito dall’espressione σέλματα νηός [fr. 4,6 W.²]” (1965, 133). See also Gerber 1970, 12.

25) Page 1964, 133. Cf. Gentili 1976, 19–20.

Thasos (and perhaps not far from Archilochus' biography, either). Archilochus might have already felt that "this was a wine with a history",²⁶ since, in the *Odyssey*, it is precisely with the wine provided by Maron, priest of the Apollon of Ismarus, that Odysseus is able to inebriate the Cyclops.²⁷ The hero describes it to the Phaeacians as a beverage sweet and divine (ἡδὺν ἀκηράσιον, θεῖον ποτόν, *Od.* 9,205), with a potent perfume (ὄδμῃ δ' ἠδέϊα ἀπὸ κρητῆρος ὀδώδει, / *θεσπεσίη*, 9,210–11), and unusually diluted with as many as twenty measures of water (*Od.* 9,208–10).²⁸ Therefore an exceptionally strong wine, and of a certain renown, a wine that perhaps differs from the simple flatbread which precedes it in the distich. Does the passage really convey that modesty of resources that some scholars have read into it? Nothing leads us to believe it really, and the etymological figure μᾶζα μεμαγμένη²⁹ could, to the contrary, represent a fine touch of poetic *dignitas*.³⁰

26) Bowra 1954, 42; see also van Groningen 1930, 75 (cf. Arnould 1980, 292); Seidensticker 1978, 20–21.

27) Odysseus had mentioned Ismarus shortly before this episode, in narrating the story of the Cicones (*Od.* 9,39–40). By way of the association with Maron and with the city of Maroneia the wine also became known as Μαρωνεΐτης (*Poll.* 6,16).

28) The wine was still acclaimed in Roman times: *Prop.* 2,33,32 *Ismario ... mero* (in reference to Polyphemus); *Ovid. Met.* 9,642 *Ismariae celebrant repetita triennia bacchae*, *F.* 3,409–14; see also *Verg. Georg.* 2,37–8 *iuvat Ismara Baccho / conserere*.

29) It has been suggested that Archilochus might be referring to the proverb μεμαγμένη μᾶζα: ἐπὶ τῶν ἐτοίμων ἀγαθῶν (*Diogen.* 3,21 and *App. prov.* 3,86, respectively *Paroem. Gr.* II 39,7 and I 432,12; *Suid.* s.v. μεμαγμένη μᾶζα, μ 548 A.). Others believe that the locus classicus of the παροιμία is a passage from Aristophanes (*Equ.* 54–7, in particular 54–5 ἐμοῦ / μᾶζαν μεμαχότος) where there is an allusion to the fact that Cleon had taken all the credit for the Athenian victory at Sphacteria (see *Thuc.* 4,29–30, 4,32,4; *Sommerstein* 1981, 147). *Lasserre* 1979, 54, however, claims that the proverb is unrelated both to Archilochus and to Aristophanes (as does *Giannini* 1988, 36 n.21).

30) Scholars often note that the flatbread (μᾶζα) was more modest than wheat-bread (ἄρτος) because it was produced with barley flour and consumed shortly after kneading, without being cooked, as is suggested by some references in Athenian comedy. What is true of V cent. comedy, though, need not be relevant to our passage. Regarding μᾶζα see *Hdt.* 1,200; *Aristoph. Equ.* 54–7 (with *schol.*^{vet} *Aristoph. Equ.* 55a and 57a, *schol.*^{Tr} *Aristoph. Equ.* 55e *Jones-Wilson*); for the distinction ἄρτος / μᾶζα see *Aristoph. Pax* 853; *Cratin. fr.* 176,2 K.-A.; *Telecl. fr.* 1,4 K.-A.; *Nicophon fr.* 6,1 K.-A.; *Zenob.* 1,12 (ἀγαθὴ καὶ μᾶζα μετ' ἄρτον); see *Olson* 1998, 67–8 ad *Aristoph. Pax* 1; *West* 1978, 307 (who cites *Aristoph. Ach.* 673 and *Vesp.* 614 regarding the fact that μᾶζα was kneaded shortly before being consumed).

If the distich were to end here, one would believe that for Archilochus ‘bread and wine’, so to speak, are ἐν δόρῳ (with the metonymy of δόρυ for “spear” already found in Homer) since they depend on the fact that he is a fighter.³¹ In other words, being a soldier represents everything that counts and everything that guarantees his survival. At first glance, this sentiment could appear to be in tune with the tones of disenchantment and antiheroism with which the poet elsewhere describes military life.³² Our understanding of the couplet is, however, redirected by the addition of the third and final element of the series. This last piece, while completing the distich, also redefines its meaning as a whole.

In terms of content, the first two cola are complementary, whereas the third colon presents itself as a peculiar expansion on the topic already touched upon with the mention of the wine of Ismarus. The concluding statement πίνω δ’ ἐν δορὶ κεκλιμένος presents a syntactic structure entirely different from that which precedes it: it is not a nominal sentence and its predicate πίνω presupposes as its subject that ‘I’ which, up until now, has only appeared in the dative. The change in the syntactic structure highlights the rhetorical impact of the anaphora.³³ As the phrase ἐν δόρῳ cannot be construed with the participle κεκλιμένος in the sense “leaning on the spear”,³⁴ it

31) For this sense of ἐν + dat., often in conjunction with the verb εἶμι, see LSJ⁹ s.v. ἐν A I 6, and for a more general overview of the anaphoric repetition of prepositions see Fehling 1969, 194–7. On the metonymy of δόρυ for “spear” see e.g. δόρυ χάλκεον, Il. 13,247; LSJ⁹ s.v. δόρυ IIa.

32) See frr. 5, 15, 20–22, 101–2 W.²

33) I prefer to interpret the syntactic-semantic nature of the last colon in these terms rather than speak of a “radical semantic shift”, as does Felson Rubin 1981, 6–7; see also Campbell 1982, 142; Rankin 1972, 473–4; Russo 1973–4, 714. The peculiarity of the final colon in Archilochus furthermore represents a difference, not to be ignored, from the verses of Hybrias the Cretan (Carm. conv. 26 P./PMG 909 ap. Athen. 15,50, 696f–697a), often held to be an imitation of Archilochus’ fragment: ἐστὶ μοι πλοῦτος μέγας δόρυ καὶ ξίφος / καὶ τὸ καλὸν λαισήϊον, πρόβλημα χρωτός / τούτῳ γὰρ ἄρῳ, τούτῳ θειρίζω, / τούτῳ πατέω τὸν ἄδυν οἶνον ἀπ’ ἀμπέλων, / τούτῳ δεσπότης μνοίας κέκλημαι. In this case it is evident that the anaphoric repetition underlines the fact that τούτῳ carries out the same syntactic function in each occurrence. Taking into account the subject matter as well, it does not seem to me (in this I concord with the reservations voiced in Bowra 1954, 37–9; Perotti 224–5; Tedeschi 1986) that the imitation is “certissima”, as claimed in Tarditi 1968, 60; see also Clay 2004, 51.

34) B. Gentili’s arguments in regard to this matter still remain valid. There is no conceptual difficulty in imagining a soldier drinking while leaning against his

takes on a slightly different meaning (“armed with my spear”, “under arms”).³⁵ At the same time, this change brings to the fore the two verbs πίνω and κεκλιμένος. They are closely associated, and in this connection the participle κεκλιμένος most likely indicates that the speaker drinks while “reclining”. This is extremely interesting, for the verb κλίνω is almost a sympotic terminus technicus.³⁶ In all like-

spear; the problem is that this cannot be expressed in Greek with ἐν δορὶ κεκλιμένος, *pace* Clay 2004, 50.

35) For similar translations compare “under arms” or “at my post” (Bowra 1954; see Webster 1959, 30; Ehrenberg 1962; Pavese 1995; Boegehold 2008, 181; cf. “vigiliae tempus” in van Groningen 1930, 77); “on active service” (Davison 1960, 2, but he ultimately prefers the translation “on my ship”); “armée de la lance” Arnould 1980, 291, with numerous supporting passages (including Aesch. *Prom.* 423–4, *Ag.* 439; *Eur. Suppl.* 593; *Aristoph. Lys.* 633). Cf. also ἐν ὄπλοις, “in or under arms” (LSJ⁹ s.v. ἐν Α Ἰ 3, with reference to e.g. *Hdt.* 1,13). Giangrande 1972 argues unconvincingly that our fragment is similar to *Anacr. PMG* 388,7 = fr. 82,7 Gentili, where ἐν δουρί indicates the pillory on which Artamon lay his neck several times (cf. also Burnett 1983, 39 n. 16). It is noteworthy that the phrase occurs in *Adesp. epigr. SH* 979,6–7 (a III cent. BCE papyrus) in reference to Ptolemy IV Philopator’s (221–205 BCE) excellence “in war and the Muses” (ὄλβιοι ὃ θνατῶν εὐεργέται, [οἰ] τὸν ἄριστον / ἐν δορὶ καὶ Μούσαις κοίρανον ἠρόσατε); similar expressions are found in *Antipater of Thessalonica* (τὰν δορὶ καὶ Μούσαις αἰπυτάταν Ἐφεσον, *AP* 9,790,4) and *Leonidas of Tarentum* (πῶς οὐκ εὐαίον ὁ Λυκάστιος, ὃς καὶ ἔρωτι / ἄρχε καὶ ἐν μολπᾷ καὶ δορὶ καὶ στάλικι, *AP* 7,449,3–4). As noted by an anonymous reviewer (whom I thank for having brought these three references to my attention), these passages may suggest that *Archilochus’* fr. 1 and 2 *W.*² derive from a single composition, but the opposition war / poetry is too vague and common to be a valid argument in this context. In closing, it is worth recalling that the funerary feast relief (*Totenmahl*) from *Hekatontapyliane* (Paros, Museum, inv. no. 758; late VI cent.) depicts a reclining heroic figure with a phiale in his hand; above the figure, along with traces of a helmet, a spear with three thongs suspended can clearly be seen (see Clay 2004, plates 13–19). For the identification of this figure with *Archilochus* see Clay 2004, 40–54, who calls attention (p. 50) to the rarity of the spear in this type of representation.

36) For some examples with the simple verb see *Hdt.* 1,211,2 κλιθέντες ἐδαίνυτο, 9,16,1 καὶ σφρον οὐ χωρὶς ἐκατέρους κλίνει; *Eur. Cycl.* 360 δασυμάλλῳ ἐν αἰγίδι κλινομένῳ (Reiske: καινόμενα L) and 543 κλίθητι νῦν μοι πλευρὰ θεῖς ἐπὶ χθονός, *TrGF* fr. 691,1 κλίθητι καὶ πίνωμεν (cf. *Comic. adesp.* fr. *745 K.-A., τί πάθη [codd.: κλίθητι Meineke] καὶ πίνωμεν); *Theocr.* 7,132–3 ἐν τε βαθείαις / ἀδείαις σχοίνωτο χαμευνίσιν ἐκλίνθημες; *Ap. Rh.* 1,1090 κεκλιμένον μαλακοῖς ἐνὶ κόεσιν οἰῶν; *Agath. AP* 5,267,3–4 ποτὶ δεῖπνον ἐπελθὼν / ζυνη κεκλιμένην ἔδρακον ἐν στιβάδι. This meaning is also attested for the compound κατακλίνω: *Hdt.* 2,121d,4 τοὺς δὲ αὐτοῦ ὡσπερ εἶχον κατακλινθέντας πίνειν διανοέεσθαι; *Aristoph. Vesp.* 1208–9 ἀλλὰ δευρὶ κατακλινεῖς προσμάνθανε / ζυμποτικός ἐναὶ καὶ ζυνουσιαστικός (see also 1210–11), *Equ.* 98 κατακλινήσομαι; *Plat. Symp.* 176a1 κατακλινέντος τοῦ Σωκράτους, 222e1–2 τεκμαίρομαι δὲ καὶ ὡς κατεκλίνῃ ἐν μέσῳ ἐμοῦ τε καὶ

lihood Archilochus' line evokes the well-known practice, in the context of the Greek symposium, of drinking propped up with the left arm while the body reclines on a bed (κλίνη); it may be "la prima attestazione di simposio reclinato in ambiente ellenico".³⁷ It was long believed that the spread in Greece of this custom, which finds significant parallels in the Near East in the X–VIII centuries BCE, dated back to the late VII century. Recent studies have instead shown that this phenomenon should be pushed back by about a century, that is to the latter half of the VIII cent., if not earlier still. This fact is not without significance for our understanding of Archilochus' poetry, for he lived in an age in which, with all probability, the practice of drinking while reclining had already been established for some time.³⁸

But if the particular syntactic construction of fr. 2 is meant to emphasize the self-representation of the speaker as 'a symposiast in arms', what are the implications of this image? Some scholars believe that the couplet is to be understood in terms of social integration (and lack thereof). According to the recent reading by P. Giannini, Archilochus' distich as a whole would in fact reveal a polemic stance towards the 'traditional' symposium. "L'enunciato del distico", he writes, "'presuppone' la pratica del banchetto e del simposio ed 'implica' un riferimento polemico ad essa".³⁹ This could be dictated by the fact that it was now no longer possible for

σοῦ (cf. also Resp. 2, 372b5–6 κατακλινέντες ἐπὶ στιβάδων ἐστρωμένων μίλακί τε καὶ μυρρίνας); Athen. 8,65, 363f οὔτε κατακλίνεσθαι παρὰ τοῖς ἀρχαίοις ἔθος. Compare the usage of κατακείμεν in Xenophan. fr. 13,2 G(entili)-Pr(ato)² = 21 B 22,2 D(iels)-K(ranz)⁶ ἐν κλίῃ μαλακῇ κατακείμενον; Callin. fr. 1,1 W.² = 1,1 G.-Pr.² with Tedeschi 1978 (preceded by Reitzenstein 1893, 50; see also Vetta 1983a, XIV and n. 3; Bowie 1990, 223; Murray 1991, 96); Xen. Anab. 6,1,4 κατακείμενοι δὲ ἐν σκίμποσιν ἐδείπνουν. Note that when the verb κλίνω is used in this sense (in the passive voice), it is often followed by ἐν + dat. or ἐπὶ + gen. to indicate the place or object upon which one is reclining (LSJ⁹, s.v. κλίνω II 4). Of course this is not the function of the phrase ἐν δορί in Archilochus' fr. 2.2.

37) Pavese 1995, 338–9.

38) Note also Archilochus' reference to the "uninvited guest", the ἄκλητος (fr. 124a–b W.², in tetrameters, addressed to a Pericles who is without doubt the same Pericles mentioned in the elegies as well, fr. 13,1 and *16 W.²); see Fehr 1990.

39) Giannini 1988, 35. See also Bowra 1954, 43: "His only furniture is his spear, and this provides the setting. ... Even in these conditions he can enjoy it [i.e. the wine of Ismarus] as if he were at some convivial occasion." See also van Groningen 1930, 78.

the poet to celebrate the symposium as he once had, perhaps because he had fallen into disrepute for his abusive words against his own friends, as Critias claims; alternatively, he could be lamenting his vagabond life in contrast to the condition of more fortunate contemporaries.⁴⁰ Such a reconstruction, however, is problematic: firstly, it is founded on the hypothesis that fr. 2 and 4 belong to a single elegy; secondly, it assumes a close interconnection with the poet's biography – an assumption especially precarious in this case. Note also that there is not much in fr. 2 that would indicate feelings of socioeconomic malcontent.⁴¹

O. Murray has challenged this approach by arguing that the elegiac couplet need not be understood as hostile; rather, it suggests a close association of military engagement and sympotic experience. The concluding statement πίνω δ' ἐν δορὶ κεκλιμένος could, in Murray's opinion, be paraphrased with "my spear is my (right to the) *symposion*". He further adds: "I would then interpret the couplet as a complete sympotic epigram, sung in the *symposion* in praise of the military life which is of course also the sympotic life: Archilochus' poem is a more elegant expression of the claim made in the *skolion* of Hybrias".⁴²

40) On Critias' criticism of Archilochus see Crit. 88 B 44 D.-K.⁶ = Archil. test. 33 Gerber (see also Lasserre 1979); Critias' reliability can be doubted, though (Rotstein 2010, 300–17). For Nicolosi 2005, 36 and 38 Archilochus is "costretto a sostituire il simposio, luogo della performance poetica, con la lancia, oggetto che emblematicamente rappresenta il preponderante impegno militare"; "sembra piuttosto lamentare, con piglio apparentemente recriminatorio, ma non senza arguta ironia, ciò che la situazione di guerra, reale o fittizia che sia, gli ha sottratto". It is not clear, however, why Archilochus would be portraying such a 'real or fictional' situation.

41) See Gerber 1970, 12 ("there is nothing very serious or critical in his words"). Commentators instead insist too much on certain details, such as the 'modesty' of the μάζα ("un cibo ... umile, adatto a schiavi e soldati", according to Giannini 1988, 36; see also Nicolosi 2005, 38–9). Admittedly, it is given to scapegoats in Hipponax (fr. 8,1–2 W.² = 28,1–2 Deg[ani]²) and it may be mentioned in Aesch. Ag. 1041 in relation to slavery (the text of the mss. may be corrupt here; D. L. Page e. g. prints †δουλίας μάζης βία†). In spite of that, μάζα does not have an intrinsically 'servile' connotation: note that Hipponax also mentions a δούλιον ἄρτον (fr. 115,8 W.² = °194,8 Deg.²) and κρίθινον κόλλικα, δούλιον χόρτον (fr. 26,6 W.² = 36,6 Deg.²); cf. also δουλίαν ... τροφήν (Soph. Ai. 499), θῆσαν τραπέζαν (Eur. Alc. 2) and θῆσαν ἐστίαν (Eur. El. 205).

42) Murray 1994, 53 (with reference to Carm. conv. 26 P./PMG 909, on which see above, n. 33); see also Hobden 2013, 37 and, more in general, Bowie 1990.

Indeed, the statement $\pi\acute{\iota}\nu\omega \delta' \acute{\epsilon}\nu \delta\omicron\rho\acute{\iota} \kappa\epsilon\kappa\lambda\iota\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\varsigma$ cannot be interpreted in wholly literal terms, that is to say as a ‘realistic’ or ‘mimetic’ description of a set of actions carried out in a determined space and time. This assertion must instead be read on a metaphoric level; only in this way can one give legitimacy to, and make sense of, that association between drinking while reclining and being armed, articulated by the anaphor $\acute{\epsilon}\nu \delta\omicron\rho\acute{\iota}$, which would be impossible in a literal sense.⁴³ We are faced with two acts intrinsically linked to the identity of the aristocratic $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\iota\tau\eta$ of the archaic age, committed, on one hand, to performing their collective role in the defense of the city and in military conquest, and increasingly inclined, on the other, to celebrate their own social primacy in that sophisticated ritual of class membership that is the symposium. Poetry mediates between these two ideal domains. Archilochus speaks as a combatant to his fellow combatants: the ‘I’ speaking in this couplet is therefore better understood as a ‘social’ ‘I’, with which Archilochus, any one of his companions, or any number of other aristocrats, can identify themselves. From this viewpoint, fr. 2 can be read as metasymptotic poetic statement. Intended for the moment in which that delightful ritual of social drinking will be celebrated, this couplet illustrates and conceptualizes that same moment in a social and collective sense.⁴⁴

This metasymptotic reading revealed in the fragment’s conclusion also helps to illuminate other details of the poetic text. There is no doubt that the wine of Ismarus reflects the wine being consumed by the participants of the symposium; the same, perhaps, can be said of the kneaded flatbread ($\mu\acute{\alpha}\zeta\alpha \mu\epsilon\mu\alpha\gamma\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta$) which precedes it in the distich. It is worth recalling the fragment of Alcman in which the furnishings of a symposium seem to be described: seven beds ($\kappa\lambda\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha\iota$) on which to recline and the same number of tables stacked with loaves of poppy-flavored bread ($\tau\rho\alpha\pi\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\delta\alpha\iota / \mu\alpha\kappa\omega\nu\acute{\iota}\omega\nu \acute{\alpha}\rho\tau\omega\nu \acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\phi\omicron\iota\sigma\alpha\iota$, PMGF fr. 19,1–2 = 11,1–2 Calame). This

43) On the basis of the internal performative characteristics – “threefold axis of reference” (Depew 2000, 62–3; see also Hobden 2013, 36) – one could say that the predicate $\pi\acute{\iota}\nu\omega$ in the fragment clarifies who is speaking (the ‘I’ of the poet) and the moment in which he is doing so (the present); regarding the setting, this element can be implicitly identified as much in the incessant toil of the soldier ($\acute{\epsilon}\nu \delta\omicron\rho\acute{\iota}$) as in the symposium (as suggested by the participle $\kappa\epsilon\kappa\lambda\iota\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\varsigma$).

44) Cf. Rossi 1983; Corner 2010, 353: “The play of self-representation stands out as one of the constitutive pleasures of this institution of pleasure.”

suggests that the setting described is that moment after the main meal (δεῖπνον) in which the ‘second tables’ (δεύτεραι τράπεζαι) are set and placed at the guests’ disposal and the group proceeds to drink their wine together with sweets and other delicacies known from sources as τραγήματα.⁴⁵ Bread (ἄρτος) appears for the first time in a specifically sympotic context in the celebrated ‘metasympotic’ elegy of Xenophanes (fr. 1 W.² = 1 G.-Pr.²). Here guests are treated to golden bread (παρκέεται δ’ ἄρτοι ξανθοί, v. 9) together with honey and cheese and, naturally, an inexhaustible source of wine (ἄλλος δ’ οἶνος ἐτοῖμος, ὃς οὐπότε φησι προδώσειν, v. 5). Despite some skepticism,⁴⁶ we can perhaps surmise that Archilochus’ flatbread may have also had its place on the symposium table.⁴⁷

If this is correct, and if the arguments discussed thus far prove convincing, then the couplet as a whole can be construed as a metasympotic commentary, that is to say a text that, while drinking, comments on the very act of drinking. The social act of drinking is

45) Despite the fact that the Alcman fragment does not speak explicitly of drinking or of wine, the majority of its interpreters are in agreement in believing that the fragment refers to a symposium (in the opinion of Calame 1983, 370 ad loc., it is more precisely the Spartan ritual banquet, the κορίς, being described; on this type of banquet see Athen. 4,16–17, 138e–140b). See Noussia 2001, 357–8 (“Even though in Alcman the specific occasion remains unclear, here too we find the description of the furniture (κλίνη-τράπεζαι) and of the desserts which accompany the drinking of the wine during a reclining sympotic feast”), with further bibliographic references. Vetta 1983a, LIV turns to Xenophanes’ fr. 1 W.² for the description of the *apparatus convivii*; De Martino and Vox 1996, I 179 speak of “quasi *secundae mensae* simposiali”. See also Boardman 1990, 124–5; Murray 1991, 92–3. For the δεύτεραι τράπεζαι see Plat. Resp. 2, 372c; Philoxen. PMG 836e; Aristot. fr. 675 Gign; Nicostr. fr. 27 K.-A.; Matro, SH 534,111–20; Athen. 14,44, 639b–d, 14,48–9, 641c–642e; for the τραγήματα see Athen. 14,44–76, 639b–658e.

46) Colesanti 1999, 71 n. 98: “In Archiloco insieme al vino troviamo la μᾶζα (fr. 2 W.), non perspicua del simposio; gli accenni al solo vino (ad es. fr. 4 W.), del resto, non sono indizio certo di simposialità.”

47) As also argued by Murray 1994, 53. In regard to this matter I find it opportune to underline that the flatbread (μᾶζα τ’ ἀμολγαίη) also appears in that sort of “symposium . . . of archaic form” (Colesanti 1999, 71), or better ‘rustic form’, described by Hesiod in his *Works and Days* (588–96), a passage which presents some similarities with Archilochus’ fr. 2 (see Bossi 1980, 26–7). Nor in Attic drama is the flatbread foreign to the imagery of the ‘rustic’ symposium, which often evokes connotations of the ideal and the utopian: see Aristoph. Eccl. 606 with Ussher 1973, 160 (“Of the etables mentioned here, the μᾶζαι . . . and τεμάχη . . . are features of the later public banquet, along with the garlands and the wine”) and Vetta 1994, 204 ad loc. For the ‘rustic’ symposium see also Xenoph. fr. 13 G.-Pr.² = 21 B 22 D.-K.⁶; Aristoph. Pax 1127–58 (cf. also Eccl. 44–5); Theocr. 7,63–70.

thus connected to the social identity of the speaker and his military pursuit. It may be surprising to find that, in other contexts, violence, conflict, and war are to be banned altogether from the sympotic space, even if only as themes for song.⁴⁸ Yet the paradox is only apparent. Archaic poetry, and especially sympotic poetry, is a medium of social interaction; as such, it reflects the aspirations and needs of different groups in different historical moments. No medium is intrinsically more fluid.⁴⁹

3. *Archilochus' fr. 4 W.²: "On this Watch"*

Once we have properly established that there are no convincing reasons to attribute fr. 2 and 4 W.² to the same elegy, the opportunity for a new reading of the second of these fragments presents itself. Critics have discussed the details provided here by Archilochus with untiring meticulousness, but the true problem resides essentially in the situation presupposed by these verses. In the eyes of many critics, fr. 4 W.² describes a moment of improvised conviviality in occasion of a military venture. The fragment's tone would therefore be that of a direct personal experience, expressed with traits of marked realism.⁵⁰ According to West, who attributes this type of composition to a "less formal military setting" in comparison to other elegies, here "the poet is a soldier on watch with companions. There is no need for heroic sentiments. Antiheroic ones are more comforting. In fr. 4 Archilochus is on a ship (beached, I suppose), and calls for wine to be opened: 'we shan't get through

48) Xenophanes (fr. 1 W.² = 1 G.-Pr.²) offers a detailed depiction of such a symposium (see e. g. Hobden 2013, 25–32, with further bibliographic references). The association between peace, banquet and symposium can be traced back to Homer; it was constantly reworked in subsequent centuries (see e. g. Od. 19,10–13; Theogn. 161–4, 885–6): see the seminal study on the subject by Slater 1981 (see also Slater 1990 and Giuseppetti 2013, 101 and n. 83).

49) See Catoni 2010, 65.

50) See Garzya 1958 = 1963, 166 ("situazione reale, esperienza diretta e accolta positivamente"); Page 1964, 129 ("personal experience . . . described in detail"); Gentili 1965, 134 ("efficace realismo ed energica personale intonazione") and Gentili 1970, 120; Podlecki 1969, 73 (the verses would have been written before Archilochus reached Thasos, "on this initial voyage, certainly one very like it"); Perotti 1985, 229–30 ("Potrebbe trattarsi, nel complesso della situazione, di una nave da guerra, sulla quale, oltre al cibo e alle bevande per i soldati, probabilmente mercenari, si trovano degli orci di vino pregiato, forse riservato al comandante").

this watch sober”.⁵¹ For Gerber, “the boredom of keeping watch on or beside an anchored ship would no doubt provide Archilochus with sufficient reason for drinking”.⁵² Without turning away from the ‘realistic’ interpretation, M. Vetta has suggested seeking an external point of reference to the situation described by Archilochus. “Il motivo del festeggiamento senza moderazione («snida il vino . . . fino alla feccia»)", he writes, “richiama piuttosto l’idea di una veglia priva di rischi, magari successiva ad un fatto d’arme conclusosi con successo. Archiloco ricrea per i compagni un’atmosfera ed una sequenza di gesti che richiamano al simposio di residenza. È chiaro dall’accenno, frammentario, agli ospiti (*xeînoi*), che non possono esserci, e al *deîpnon*, che è stato solo un frugale pasto di soldati di mare. L’invito «gira con quel bicchiere per la nave», rivolto al compagno, è la trasposizione dell’invito che nel simposio cittadino si soleva rivolgere all’inserviente. Egli dovrà attingere direttamente dagli orci, anziché dal cratere, vino non miscelato con acqua, e dovrà farlo col *kóthōn*, la grossa coppa militare”. In conclusion, the elegy describes “un simposio deviante dal suo rituale di oggetti e gesti consueti in relazione ad un evento particolare”.⁵³ However, the line between ‘normal’ and ‘deviant’, as often occurs, is in this case rather blurred. For the situation in which the narrator finds himself to be ‘deviant’, vv. 2–5 need have a markedly negative connotation. These lines, however, are too patchy for one to draw from them a meaning of this kind. There are no elements which confirm that the guests (? ξεινοί, fr. 4,3) are absent or that the meal (δεῖπνον, fr. 4,4) is meagre.⁵⁴ On the contrary, one could even claim that vv. 2–5 make reference to a conventional dinner party which then, in the following verses, is described as if it were taking place aboard a ship.

51) West 1974, 11. West would also attribute Archilochus’ frs. 1, 2, and 5 to this “less formal military setting”.

52) Gerber 1981, 3. See also Bowra 1954, 43: “... when he is on watch in a ship at sea, he looks forward to a good evening.”

53) Vetta 1983a, XV–XVI, who, for this type of ‘deviant’ symposium, also refers to Alc. frs. 332, 335 and 346 V; see also Catoni 2010, 252–3 and Giannini 1988, 41–2: “Il poeta sta facendo dunque la guardia sulla nave (o accanto alla nave; comunque sulla terraferma) e vuole trasformare questa occasione di guerra in un momento simposiale”.

54) Gerber 1981, 3 and especially Bowie 1986, 17.

In fact, it is rather difficult to interpret the situation described by Archilochus in the most legible part of his elegy in a wholly ‘realistic’ or ‘mimetic’ sense.⁵⁵ How can one be on guard duty while at the same time calling upon companions to leave every trace of sobriety behind? If the poet was giving voice to an expression of ‘authentic’ military vocation, how ever could he do so in disregard of his duty to remain vigil and alert, as had already been prescribed by Homer?⁵⁶ Even those critics who have continued to support the ‘realistic’ nature of the situation described in fr. 4 W.² cannot help recognizing, at times, that the poet would thus be displaying “un atteggiamento per lo meno spregiudicato nei confronti delle norme militari”.⁵⁷ There also exist other difficulties of a more general nature in the hypothesis that archaic elegy, especially in the case of shorter poems, could have been performed in contexts other than the symposium or the κῶμος: “other proposed contexts – troops marshalled to enter battle, soldiers on guard duty, political assemblies, small gatherings in sight of a public fountain – are inadequately supported by the texts cited”.⁵⁸

If the ‘realistic’ reading proves insufficient to account for the situation described in our elegy, it will perhaps be necessary to point out that, in general, the relationship that exists between archaic poetic texts and their performative contexts can be of several kinds. Very often the text may describe the actual context of its

55) This point is aptly highlighted in Bowie 1986, 16. Cf. the caution expressed by D’Alessio 2009, 116–7: “We have no way of telling, though, whether this particular poem was composed for a performance while the poet and his companions were keeping watch on a ship, or whether it more generically evokes a situation the sympotic audience or the poet may have faced or may have expected to face.” See also Gerber 1981, 11 n. 6, who however maintains that “the circumstances surrounding the poem’s composition and delivery” do not have any bearing on the interpretation of the fragment.

56) See Il. 7,371 = 18,299, 10,96–101, 10,180–93, 10,418–22; see also 8,521–2 and 8,529–65; Hes. fr. 294,3–4 M.-W. In the oration *Against Conon*, Demosthenes accuses the sons of Conon of being soldiers without merit since they drink all day, even when on watch: ἔπινον ἐκάστοθ’ οὔτοι τὴν ἡμέραν, ἐπειδὴ τάχιστ’ ἀριστήσαιεν, ὄλην, καὶ τοῦθ’, ἕως περ ἡμεν ἐν τῇ φρουρᾷ, διετέλον ποιούντες. . . ἦν οὖν δειπνοποιεῖσθαι τοῖς ἄλλοις ὄραν συμβαίνοι, ταύτην ἂν ἦδη ἐπαρόνουν οὔτοι, τὰ μὲν πόλλ’ εἰς τοὺς παῖδας ἡμῶν τοὺς ἀκολούθους, τελευτῶντες δὲ καὶ εἰς ἡμᾶς αὐτούς (Demosth. Or. 54,3–4).

57) Giannini 1988, 42.

58) Bowie 1986, 21. See the persuasive discussion in Bowie 1986, 15–21; see also Bowie 1990; Murray 1991; Irwin 2005, 35–62 and *passim*.

performance, but of course this is not an absolute rule. At times the poetic text becomes an instrument for the construction of a fictitious or, so to speak, imaginary situation, with which the performer and audience can identify themselves in several respects; the variety of these possibilities for identification also depend upon the text's potential for reperformance.⁵⁹ The most important elements from this point of view are naturally the text's indexical signs, that is to say those indications regarding the subjects involved in communication and their collocation in time and space.

In the case of Archilochus' fr. 4, what appears most evident is that the subject is a 'we' (ἡμεῖς, 8, cf. δυνησόμεθα, 9), located spatially on a ship (σέλματα νηός, 6) and temporally "on this watch" (ἐν φυλακῇ τῆδε, 9). In regard to this, it has been said that "the reference to 'guard-duty' in line 8 creates a bridge between the envisaged and the real situation: remote as that situation is from guard-duty, it can with relish be described as a 'sort of' guard duty".⁶⁰ In actuality, it may in fact be possible to assert that v. 8 creates a bridge between the envisaged and the real situation precisely thanks to the deictic temporal reference ἐν φυλακῇ τῆδε (9) which essentially creates an identification of the two. From this point of view, it is necessary to underline that the noun φυλακή may imply a temporal indication and specifically refer to the subdivision of the night into shifts of guard / watch duty.⁶¹ This meaning is attested from the V cent. on, but it is worth noting that, in Homer, the noun φυλακή is always associated with the night in its primary meaning of 'watching or guarding'.⁶² But aside from this linguistic detail there is, more generally speaking, a 'consonance' of extralinguistic nature which proves crucial.

59) See in general Albert 1988; D'Alessio 2004 and 2009. Cf. also Bakker 2009, 123–4; Steiner 2012, 38–40.

60) Bowie 1986, 17, with reference to Tyrnt. fr. 12,13–14 W.² (ἦδ' ἀρετή, τόδ' ἄεθλον κτλ.) for the demonstrative adjective meaning 'this sort of' rather than 'this'.

61) LSJ⁹ s.v. φυλακή I 4; even in reference to the simple meaning of 'watching or guarding' LSJ⁹ adds "esp. by night".

62) Il. 7,371 = 18,299, 8,521, 9,1.471, 10,99.408.416. The number of night watches / shifts varied; see Poll. 1,70; Suid. s.v. φυλακή (φ 822 A.). Some ancient interpreters, observing that in Homer the night was at times divided into three parts (Il. 10,252–3, Od. 12,312 ≈ 14,483), believed that the poet had subdivided the night into three shifts (e.g. schol.^A Il. 10,252, ΠΙ 48,16–49,1 E.: τριφύλακος γὰρ ἦν καθ' Ὀμηρον ἢ νύξ). Cf. also Stesich. PMGF fr. 268 = 297 Finglass; Simon. PMG 644 = 317 Poltera; Eur. Rhés. 5. The sense 'watch of the night' is first attested in Hdt. 9,51 (ἐπεὰν τῆς νυκτὸς ἢ δευτέρῃ φυλακῇ).

The sympotic gathering generally took place after sunset⁶³ and staying awake, that is ‘vigil’, to the very end, despite the effects of inebriation, could even offer, at times, a reason for the symposiasts to compete with each other. This is particularly explicit in a few later sources. In Callimachus’ Παννυχίς (fr. 227 Pf.), for example, he who manages to stay awake (ὁ δ’ ἀγρυπνήσας [συνεχῆς] μέχρι τῆς κοίρωνης, fr. 227,5 Pf.)⁶⁴ will receive “the honey cake (τὸν πυραμοῦντα) and the kottabos prize”: without doubt it must have been a well-known sympotic game, already familiar to the Athenian public of the late V cent., as Aristophanes uses πυραμοῦς as a synonym for victory (Equ. 277). Returning to our fragment of Archilochus, we can say that the nocturnal nature of the sympotic entertainment was in itself sufficient to make any symposiast who found himself listening to the archaic poet’s elegy come to the immediate realization that his own concrete situation was reflected in the poetic text.⁶⁵

A different possibility for the comprehension of the fragment as a whole thus presents itself: not the pure and simple description of a single event but, rather, the construction of a fictional situation in which any symposiast could see himself. This does not mean, it must be said, that the fragment consists of pure invention, with no bearing whatsoever on reality. Precisely the fact that the accent is placed with such clarity on the military service of the ‘we’ who speak these verses, on the contrary, leads us to believe that this domain must have been very relevant to the social identity claimed by Archilochus and his companions. The relationship between social reality and poetic discourse, in other words, can be accomplished in a very nuanced manner. But we shall have the opportunity to go back to this aspect.

For the moment let us return briefly to the deictic expression ἐν φυλακῇ τῆδε (9): in addition to this there are in fact other ele-

63) See e. g. Ion Chius fr. 27,7 W.² πίνωμεν, παίζωμεν, ἴτω διὰ νυκτὸς αἰοιδῆ.

64) On the meaning of the expression μέχρι τῆς κοίρωνης see D’Alessio 2007, Π 658 n. 6. On the sympotic nature of this game see, in addition to the Diegesis (προτροπὴ τοῖς συμποσίταις εἰς τὸ ἀγρυπνεῖν, 10,8–9), Plut. Mor. 747a–b; Athen. 14,56 (647c), 15,7 (668c); Poll. 6,108; schol.^{vet} Aristoph. Equ. 277a Jones-Wilson εἰώθασι γὰρ ἐν τοῖς συμποσίοις ἀμιλλάσθαι περὶ ἀγρυπνίας, καὶ ὁ διαγρυπνήσας μέχρι τῆς ἑὼ ἐλάμβανε τὸν πυραμοῦντα.

65) Cf. also Theogn. 1043–4 εὔδομεν· φυλακῆ δὲ πόλεως φυλάκεσσι μελήσει / ἀστυφέλης ἐρατῆς πατρίδος ἡμετέρης. According to Ferrari 1989, 247 the couplet has a metasymphotic character, but cf. van Groningen 1966, 389–90.

ments in the situation described in fr. 4 that may reflect the concrete practice of the symposium. The mere fact that the speaker expresses an order to pour the wine and drink without hesitation renders him quite similar, in some respects, to the figure of the symposiarch, who had the job of supervising and moderating the drinking party.⁶⁶ The figure tasked with unstopping the jugs – a “compagno d’armi”⁶⁷ according to the common interpretation – fulfils here the same function as the *παῖς* who, in some of Anacreon’s fragments, is at the disposal of the feasters and is naturally addressed in the second person.⁶⁸ It is therefore not surprising to find the same objects used in fr. 4 in sympotic contexts as well. The *κώθων* is a small, wide-mouthed vessel fitted with a handle, quite similar in form to a small pitcher; Athenaeus, after having cited fr. 4, identifies it with the cup (*κύλιξ*), while the scholia to Aristophanes consider it the equivalent of the *κύαθος*, often used to draw wine from the *krater*.⁶⁹ The *κάδος*, substantially a jug or amphora, is instead used above all for wine; in a definitely sympotic context, it also appears in Anacreon.⁷⁰

66) Regarding the *συμποσίαρχος* see e.g. Xen. An. 6,1,30; Alex. fr. 21 K.-A.; in the songs of Elephantine the figure is defined ὁ ποταρχῶν (τοῦ δὲ ποταρχοῦντος πειθόμεθα, Adesp. eleg. 27,9 W.²).

67) Perrotta and Gentili 1965, 66.

68) Anacr. PMG 356a = 33,1–6 Gent., PMG 396 = 38 Gent. See also Alc. fr. 346,2 V. (ἄϊτα, of debated exegesis, however).

69) Athen. 11,66, 483d (ὡς τῆς κύλικος λεγομένης κώθωνος; Kaibel however considers the passage suspect); schol.^{vet} Aristoph. Pax 1094b Holwerda (τὸ νῦν λεγόμενον κύαθον); for the usage of the *κύαθος* to dip into the wine see Anacr. PMG 356a,5 = 33,1–6 Gent.; Plat. Com. fr. 192 K.-A.; Xen. Cyr. 1,3,9. More in general regarding the *κώθων* see Athen. 11,66, 483a–484c; Lazzarini 1973–4, 365–9. According to Critias’ *Constitution of the Spartans*, also cited by Athenaeus, the Spartans made use of the *κώθων* especially during military campaigns since the rim of the cup allowed them to filter the impurities from their water (Crit. 88 B 34 D.-K.⁶ ap. Athen. 11,66, 483b; see also Plut. Lyc. 9,7; Poll. 6,97). Many commentators (see, among others, Gigante 1958, 53) have sustained that this was the type of *κώθων* mentioned by Archilochus. It is however more probable that “i Laconi avessero escogitato un tipo particolare di vaso per bere di uso esclusivamente militare, del tipo appunto di una fiasca” (Lazzarini 1973–4, 368); it is hard to imagine that Archilochus made reference to a specifically Laconian cup, as also pointed out by Gerber 1981, 2.

70) See Anacr. PMG 373,2 = 98,2 Gent.; see also Athen. 11,45, 472e; Lazzarini 1973–4, 363–5; Aloni 1983. Aloni 1983, 49 highlights that Archilochus’ fr. 4 represent the first occurrence of *κάδος*, “parola di origine semitica (o di sostrato), orientale dunque per i Greci, che probabilmente la importarono insieme al contenitore che essa designava, e al contenuto di questo: vino fenicio con ogni probabilità”.

It is quite peculiar that Archilochus has chosen a ship as the ‘setting’ of his fr. 4. There may have been further details in the badly damaged upper portion of the papyrus. In any case, this portion was very short, since the second line of the papyrus is the first of the elegy.⁷¹ The choice of the ship can perhaps be understood better in light of a sympotic metaphor carefully studied by W. J. Slater. Especially from the V cent. on, symposium participants find themselves described as passengers aboard a ship in situations that shift from smooth sailing to the raging storm. One of the best-known episodes is recounted by Timaeus: he informs us that “there is a house in Acragas referred to as the Trireme for the following reason. Some young men were getting drunk inside; and their drunkenness made them so feverishly crazy that they thought they were sailing on a trireme and had run into a terrible storm at sea”.⁷² The close association between Dionysus, wine, and the sea, on one hand, and the symposium with its behaviour, language, and apparatus, on the other, are at the root of the literary success of the metaphoric identification of the symposium with a ship and its crew.⁷³ But remarkable interactions can be found also in the context of plastic and figurative arts. On a rather generic level, it is worth recalling that certain types of vessels can assume not only the name but also, in part, the form of a ship (for instance the ἄκατος, the κόνθαρος, and the τριή-

71) The mark in the lefthand margin of v. 2 was interpreted in the editio princeps as a stichometric indication; West in his edition correctly interprets it as a coronis which, together with the paragraphos, signals the beginning of a new poem in correspondence with v. 2 on the papyrus – therefore the first of our elegy.

72) Timae. FGrHist 566 F 149 ap. Athen. 2,5, 37b–c (trans. S. D. Olson).

73) Slater 1976 (cited in Bowie 1986, 16–18 in relation to Archilochus’ fr. 4), with reference primarily to Pind. fr. 124a M.; Dion. Chalc. fr. 5d W.; Choeril. Sam. SH 329 = PEG fr. 9 (though Lloyd-Jones and Parsons wonder whether the fragment should be attributed to Choerilus of Iasos); Timae. FGrHist 566 F 149, but also Eur. Cycl. 577 (ὡς ἐξένευσα μόγις, shortly after the statement σκάφος ὀλκὰς ὡς γεμισθεῖς / ποτὶ σέλμα γαστρὸς ἄκρας, 505–6); Xenarch. fr. 2 K.-A.; Eratosth. CA fr. 36; Cic. Orat. 1,164 (*tempestas comissationis*); Plut. Quaest. conv. 1,4, 622a–b. For the association between Dionysus and the sea in a religious context, cf. e.g. the Ionian festival of Dionysus’ return (*Καταγωγή*), in which the god came to the city once a year in his own boat. After Slater the theme of the ‘symposium at sea’ has also been explored by other scholars: see Davies 1978; Lissarrague 1990a, 107–22; Gentili 1995, 262–84; Davidson 1997, 44–5; Corner 2010; Steiner 2012. On marine imagery in Greek poetry in general see Kahlmeyer 1934; more specific are the analyses by Bonner 1941 (the port) and Murgatroyd 1995 (the erotic sphere).

ρης).⁷⁴ A more sophisticated case is represented by the famous ‘eye cup’ by Exekias found at Vulci (c. mid-VI cent. BCE).⁷⁵ Inside this kylix the painter shows Dionysus reclining on a ship with a large drinking horn in his hand; two vine branches laden with bunches of grapes grow upwards from where the god is reclining and dominate the scene’s upper register; in the lower register swims a pod of dolphins. The myth narrated in the Homeric *Hymn to Dionysus* (7) is often cited in connection with this image: the god, shipbound prisoner of Tyrrhenian pirates, before breaking free, makes wine gurggle prodigiously onto their ship and covers it with ivy and vines heavy with grapes (h. Hom. 7,35–42).⁷⁶ To some scholars, the cup painted by Exekias may represent a perfect equivalent to the situation described by Archilochus in his fr. 2 and 4: “Dioniso sulla nave della coppa di Exechias [...] nel suo tratto realistico lascia facilmente immaginare quale fosse la posizione descritta dal poeta: il dio vi appare sdraiato con il gomito sinistro poggiato sulla plancia mentre tiene nella destra il grande corno pieno di vino”.⁷⁷ It must however not be forgotten that the scene portrayed by Exekias is first and foremost “a sympotic Dionysus on board a real ship, either celebrating a komos or reclining in sympotic fashion”,⁷⁸ or better yet, “it is the first known representation of him as a symposiast”.⁷⁹ Thus an essentially symbolic image, which intends to represent Dionysus, as F. Lissarrague writes, in his ‘triumph’, “a symposiast on the wine-dark sea, lord of plant life and ocean life, and likewise master of metamorphoses and of metaphors that become visions”.⁸⁰ In other

74) ἄκατος; Telest. PMG 811; Theop. Com. fr. 4 K.-A. (cf. Epicr. fr. 9,1 K.-A.); κἀνθαρος; Men. fr. 246,4 K.-A.; τριήρης; Antiphan. fr. 223,4 K.-A.; Epinic. fr. 2,8 K.-A. On ship-shaped vessels in general see Ambrosini 2010. I thank Dr V. Parisi for her useful suggestions concerning this topic.

75) München, Staatliche Antikensammlungen und Glyptothek 8729 (2044); Beazley, ABV 146.21; LIMC s.v. “Dionysos” 788; Daraki 1982; Lissarrague 1990a, 120–2; 1990b, 207; Mommsen 2005, 21–6; Isler-Kerényi 2007, 171–87.

76) Thus Pavese 1995, 339: “la coppa di Exechias [...] illustra non un reale situazione [...] ma piuttosto il mito narrato da Hy. Hom. 7”; cf. however Isler-Kerényi 2007, 185: “As Exekias had wished to represent Dionysos as a bearded symposiast, the image on the vase cannot have depended directly on poetry: however, both express similar conceptions of the god.”

77) Gentili 1970, 120.

78) Slater 1976, 165–6.

79) Isler-Kerényi 2007, 186.

80) Lissarrague 1990a, 122.

terms, the iconography here invites us to conceptualize the relationship that artistic language establishes with reality in a more nuanced way. The image, like the poetic text, need not be a mere reflection of reality, for it can evoke and mold in complex fashion our perception and understanding of what is real. The Exekias cup also demonstrates that Dionysus, wine, and the sea are already intensely interconnected in the mid-VI cent. BCE. Slater is undoubtedly right in concluding that “those poems of Archilochus apparently written at sea are no more likely to have been written at sea than paraclausithyra on doorsteps, but they would make sense if one spliced the mainbrace in one’s own triclinium, while claiming the sea as dramatic background”.⁸¹

The ship aboard which Archilochus describes himself and his companions is therefore not necessarily a real ship, and the situation which he describes is not unequivocally anchored in a ‘here’ and ‘now’. This situation rather refers to a scenario that would have been extremely familiar to the poet, his audience, and many other *hetairoi* of their time – the aristocratic symposium. The ship of which Archilochus speaks may be an imaginary one, a sympotic ship, and aboard it is described a scene in which the poet and his audience can easily imagine themselves.⁸²

The symposiasts, reclining on their beds / couches, would have been able to identify themselves with ease with the soldiers / sailors aboard the ship, since the *σέλματα νηός* (6) would be no other than the *κλῖναι* arranged along the walls of the banqueting hall (*ἀνδρών*); the companion called upon to go up and down the ship to pour the wine could have been identified just as easily with one of the servants placed at the guests’ disposal.⁸³ At the same

81) Slater 1976, 168. See Steiner 2012 for an ingenious metasympotic reading of Archilochus’ fr. 13 W.² For a much-discussed Roman example, compare Horace’s Epode 9 with Fraenkel 1957, 71–5; Slater 1976, 168–9; contra Watson 2003, 310–17.

82) See Steiner 2012, 41–2. A rather ‘open’ interpretation is offered by Burnett 1983, 39: fr. 4 would be “a broken elegy whose pretended occasion is a storm at sea [...]. In the fiction, the singer urges imaginary men to respond to the chaos of nature with a breach of discipline, and he seems to promise a moment of sublime solidarity as their reward. That moment of drunken defiance of both danger and order is recognised as worthy of the Muse, and it is conveyed to the actual men who listen to the song”.

83) As we have already had the opportunity to observe above, there is nothing in vv. 2–5 that would indicate a situation of difficulty or unease.

time, the very fact that the elegy presupposes a close relationship with the symposium as its performative context, together with the already discussed metaphoric connection between the symposium and the sea, attractively supports the possibility that, from a thematic point of view, the scene described by Archilochus in fr. 4 might represent a further element of identification from the point of view of his archaic audience. Critics have at times insisted upon Archilochus' presumed departure in fr. 4 from the (assumed) usual sympotic practice; they interpret it as a true 'deviation' of his drinking party. They stress the absence of the krater, for example, and even argue that the poet here intended to drink undiluted wine, thereby going against Greek customs.⁸⁴ Still, it is difficult to believe that the passage makes reference to a generally stigmatized and, in any case, decidedly rare practice. Furthermore, ἀπὸ τρυγός (8) only refers to how one should dip into the wine (i.e. down to the last drop, so that none remains).⁸⁵ Perhaps, more simply, the poet is touching upon the usual apparatus and proceedings of the sympotic gathering in an evocative manner; he uses marine and military imagery to conjure up the situation in which his audience would be able to find themselves. For the precise reason that it was well known how the common drinking session would have played out, there was no need to describe in great detail every moment of the event: a simple evocation of the situation would have sufficed so that the rest of the elegy could elaborate other elements. Such a conclusion renders critics' exhaustive discussions on this and other details of the scene largely superfluous.⁸⁶

84) Vetta 1983a, XV–XVI; Giannini 1988, 37 and 41.

85) Even when sources speak of exceptionally "intense" drinks, reference is always being made to the high proportion of wine to water, not to the total absence of any form of dilution: see e.g. Anacr. PMG 356a = 33,1–6 Gent.; Alc. fr. 346 V.

86) It has been pondered whether the σέλματα (6) of the ship are the benches of the oarsmen (Gigante 1958) or the bridge (Monaco 1955–6, 187–8 and 1960; Treu 1959, 23 and 191; Garzya 1958 = 1963, 164; cf. Page 1964, 129 and Gerber 1981, 4–5); whether the ship in question is at sea (Gigante 1958, 54; Burnett 1983, 39) or it has been beached (West 1974, 11); whether the verb φοιτάω (7) means "andare su e giù" (Gigante 1958: 51–2, with reference to Od. 12,420), "attraversare" (Monaco 1955–6 and 1960; cf. Page 1964: 129–30) or even "scendere [below deck] a guisa di ombra, nella notte" (Garzya 1958 = 1963, 164–5, on the basis of an erroneous comparison with Synesius); whether vv. 6–8 represent a hysteron-proteron (Gigante 1958, 53–4) or not (Monaco 1955–6 and 1960). It has even been said that ἄγρει (8) suggests a "lotta che deve sostenere colui che attinge il vino alla feccia" (Giannini

The metaphoric projection onto a symposium in progress of a crew making merry aboard their ship could have assumed various connotations for Archilochus and his audience. At this point in history, when many cities were growing in wealth and prestige through colonial expansion, the images of the ship and the watch would have been significant on multiple levels, and also very appropriate to the joint sense of cohesion and exclusivity so often characteristic of the aristocratic symposium. Fr. 4 might also reference one of the many forms of entertainment that were standard at sympotic gatherings, such as challenges to resist the effects of inebriation, demonstrations of how to drink from a difficult to manage cup, or other ‘tests’ which abundant doses of wine made as complicated to complete as they were entertaining to watch.⁸⁷ In any event, the fact remains that the possibility that Archilochus’ fr. 4 describes a situation more imaginary than real should come as no great surprise: the archaic symposium was the space par excellence designed for an established and ‘exclusive’ language, “intelligibile solo a chi partecipava alla vita comunitaria di una consorzeria politica (eteria) o di un più ampio gruppo sociale”.⁸⁸

References cited

- Albert, W., *Das mimetische Gedicht in der Antike. Geschichte und Typologie von den Anfängen bis in die augusteische Zeit*, Frankfurt am Main 1988.
- Aloni, A., *Le Muse di Archiloco. Ricerche sullo stile archilocheo*, Copenhagen 1981.
- Aloni, A., *Osservazioni su gr. κάδος*, *Acme* 36 (1983) 43–9.
- Aloni, A., *The Proem of Simonides’ Plataea Elegy and the Circumstances of its Performance*, in: D. Boedeker / D. Sider (Hrsg.), *The New Simonides: Contexts of Praise and Desire*, Oxford 2001, 86–105.

1988, 41; see also Grazya 1958 = 1963, 168; Page 1964, 130), based on an uncertain derivation of the verb ἄγρω from the noun ἄγρα, “hunt” (see Chantraine 1968–80, 14) or that, with ξεινοί (3), the reader must identify “«stranieri» che assoldano i naviganti, a meno che il termine non indichi i mercenari stessi” (Garzya 1958 = 1963, 169). One cannot but agree with Gerber 1981, 10 when he writes that “many of the colourful additions made by commentators should be banished from any discussion of this poem”.

87) See Steiner 2012, 41–2. For entertainment of this kind, see Slater 1976, 167–8 and Lissarrague 1990a, 76–80.

88) Gentili 1995, 57.

- Aloni, A. / A. Iannucci, *L'elegia greca e l'epigramma dalle origini al V secolo. Con un'appendice sulla "nuova" elegia di Archiloco*, Firenze 2007.
- Ambrosini, L., Sui vasi plastici configurati a prua di nave (trireme) in ceramica argentata e a figure rosse, *MEFRA* 122 (2010) 73–115.
- Arnould, D., *Archiloque et le vin d'Ismaros* (fr. 2 Diehl = 2 West = 7 Lasserre-Bonnard), *RPh* 54 (1980) 284–94.
- Bahntje, U., *Quaestiones Archilocheae*, Diss. Göttingen 1900.
- Bakker, E. J., Homer, Odysseus, and the Narratology of Performance, in: J. Grethlein / A. Rengakos (Hrsg.), *Narratology and Interpretation: The Content of Narrative Form in Ancient Literature*, Berlin / New York 2009, 117–36.
- Blakeway, A., The Date of Archilochus, in: *Greek Poetry and Life. Essays Presented to G. Murray on his Seventieth Birthday*, Jan. 2, 1936, Oxford 1936, 33–56.
- Boardman, J., *Symposion Furniture*, in: *Murray* 1990, 122–31.
- Boegehold, A. L., Ways of Reading Archilochos Fr. 2 West, in: D. Katsonopoulou / I. Petropoulos / S. Katsarou (Hrsg.), *Archilochus and his Age. Proceedings of the Second International Conference on the Archaeology of Paros and the Cyclades*, Athens 2008, 181–90.
- Bonner, C., *Desired Haven*, *HThR* 34 (1941) 49–67.
- Bossi, F., *Archil. fr. 2 (e 4) W.*, *QUCC* 34 (1980) 23–7.
- Bossi, F., *Studi su Archiloco*, Bari ²1990.
- Bowie, E. L., *Early Greek Elegy, Symposium and Public Festival*, *JHS* 106 (1986) 13–35.
- Bowie, E. L., *Miles Ludens? The Problem of Martial Exhortation in Early Greek Elegy*, in: *Murray* 1990, 221–9.
- Bowra, C. M., *A Couplet of Archilochus*, *AFC* 6 (1954) 37–43 (repr. in: *On Greek Margins*, Oxford 1970, 67–71).
- Braswell, B. K., *A Commentary on the Fourth Pythian Ode of Pindar*, Berlin / New York 1988.
- Burnett, A. P., *Three Archaic Poets: Archilochus, Alcaeus, Sappho*, London 1983.
- Burzacchini, G., *Citazioni dotte come espediente retorico nell'Epistola 130 Garzya-Roques di Sinesio*, in: U. Criscuolo (Hrsg.), *La retorica greca fra tardo antico ed età bizantina: idee e forme*, Napoli 2012, 157–68.
- Calame, C., *Alcman*, Roma 1983.
- Campbell, D. A., *Greek Lyric Poetry: A Selection of Early Greek Lyric, Elegiac and Iambic Poetry*, Bristol ²1982.
- Catoni, M. L., *Bere vino puro. Immagini del simposio*, Milano 2010.
- Cazzato, V. / D. Obbink / E. E. Prodi (Hrsg.), *The Cup of Song: Studies on Poetry and the Symposion*, Oxford 2016.
- Chantraine, P., *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*, Paris 1968–80.
- Clay, D., *Archilochos Heros: The Cult of Poets in the Greek Polis*, Cambridge (MA) / London 2004.
- Colesanti, G., *Il simposio in Omero*, *MD* 43 (1999) 41–75.
- Corner, S., *Transcendent Drinking: The Symposium at Sea Reconsidered*, *CQ* 60 (2010) 352–80.
- Crönert, W., *Archilochi elegiae*, Göttingen 1911.
- D'Alessio, G. B., *Past Future and Present Past: Temporal Deixis in Greek Archaic Lyric*, *Arethusa* 37 (2004) 267–94.
- D'Alessio, G. B., *Callimaco, I: Inni, Epigrammi, Ecalle, II: Aitia, Giambi e altri frammenti*, Milano ²2007.

- D'Alessio, G. B., Language and Pragmatics, in: F. Budelmann (Hrsg.), *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Lyric*, Cambridge 2009, 114–29.
- Daraki, M., Οἴνου πόντος. La mer dionysiaque, *RHR* 199 (1982) 3–22.
- Davidson, J., *Courtesans and Fishcakes: The Consuming Passions of Classical Athens*, London 1997.
- Davies, M. I., Sailing, Rowing, and Sporting in One's Cup on the Wine-Dark Sea. ἄλαδε, μύσται, in: W. A. P. Childs (Hrsg.), *Athens Comes of Age: From Solon to Salamis*, Princeton (NJ) 1978, 72–95.
- Davison, J. A., Archilochus Fr. 2 Diehl, *CR* 10 (1960) 1–4.
- De Martino, O. / F. Vox, *Lirica greca I–III*, Bari 1996.
- Dentzer, J.-M., *Le motif du banquet couché dans le Proche-Orient et le monde grec du VII^{ème} au IV^{ème} siècle avant J.-C.*, Paris 1982.
- Depew, M., Enacted and Represented Dedications: Genre and Greek Hymn, in: M. Depew / D. Obbink (Hrsg.), *Matrices of Genre: Authors, Canons, and Society*, Cambridge (MA) / London 2000, 59–79.
- Diehl, E., *Anthologia lyrica Graeca 3: Iamborum scriptores*, Lipsiae ³1952.
- Dover, K. J., The Poetry of Archilochos, in: Archiloque, *Vandœuvres / Genève* 1964, 181–222.
- Ehrenberg, V., Archilochus, Frag. 2 D., *CPh* 57 (1962) 239–40.
- Fehling, D., *Die Wiederholungsfiguren und ihr Gebrauch bei den Griechen vor Gorgias*, Berlin / New York 1969.
- Fehr, B., Entertainers at the Symposium: The Akletoi in the Archaic Period, in: Murray 1990, 185–95.
- Felson Rubin, N., Radical Semantic Shifts in Archilochus, *CJ* 77 (1981) 1–8.
- Ferrari, F., *Teognide: Elegie*, Milano 1989.
- Fraenkel, E., *Horace*, Oxford 1957.
- Garzya, A., Una variazione archilochea in Sinesio, *Maia* 10 (1958) 66–71 (repr. in Garzya 1963, 161–9).
- Garzya, A., *Studi sulla lirica greca. Da Alcmane al primo impero*, Messina / Firenze 1963.
- Garzya, A., *Opere di Sinesio di Cirene. Epistole Operette Inni*, Torino 1989.
- Garzya, A. / D. Roques, *Synésios de Cyrène II. Correspondance. Lettres I–LXIII*, Paris 2003 (a).
- Garzya, A. / D. Roques, *Synésios de Cyrène III. Correspondance. Lettres LXIV–CLVI*, Paris 2003 (b).
- Gentili, B., Interpretazione di Archiloco fr. 2D = 7 L.-B., *RFIC* 93 (1965) 129–34.
- Gentili, B., L'interpretazione dei lirici greci arcaici nella dimensione del nostro tempo, *QUCC* 8 (1969) 7–21.
- Gentili, B., La lancia di Archiloco e le figurazioni vascolari, in: *Studia Florentina A. Ronconi sexagenario oblata*, Roma 1970, 115–20.
- Gentili, B., Nota ad Archiloco, *P. Col. 7511; Fr. 2 Tard.*, 2 West, *QUCC* 21 (1976) 17–21.
- Gentili, B., Archiloco e la funzione politica della poesia del biasimo, *QUCC* 11 (1982) 7–28.
- Gentili, B., *Poesia e pubblico nella Grecia antica. Da Omero al V secolo*, Roma / Bari ³1995.
- Gentili, B. / C. Catenacci, *Polinnia. Poesia greca arcaica*, Messina / Firenze ³2007.
- Gerber, D. E., *Euterpe. An Anthology of Early Greek Lyric, Elegiac, and Iambic Poetry*, Amsterdam 1970.

- Gerber, D. E., Archilochus, fr. 4 West: A Commentary, ICS 6 (1981) 1–11.
- Gerber, D. E., Early Greek Elegy and Iambus 1921–1989, *Lustrum* 33 (1991) [1993] 7–225.
- Gerber, D. E., Greek Iambic Poetry. From the Seventh to the Fifth Centuries BC, Cambridge (MA) / London 1999.
- Giangrande, G., Archiloque au pilori, QUCC 14 (1972) 37–40.
- Giannini, P., Il 'Convito' di Archiloco (fr. 2 e 7 Tarditi = 2 e 4 West), *Rudiae* 1 (1988) 31–44.
- Gigante, M., Interpretazioni archilochee, AAP 7 (1958) 51–5.
- Giuseppetti, M., L'isola esile. Studi sull'Inno a Delo di Callimaco, Roma 2013.
- Graham, A. J., The Foundation of Thasos, ABSA 73 (1978) 61–98.
- van Groningen, B. A., De Archilochi fragmento secundo, *Mnemosyne* 58 (1930) 74–8.
- van Groningen, B. A., Théognis: Le premier livre, Amsterdam 1966.
- Henry, W. B., An Archilochus Papyrus?, ZPE 121 (1998) 94.
- Hobden, F., The Symposium in Ancient Greek Society and Thought, Cambridge 2013.
- Hose, M., Synesios und seine Briefe. Versuch der Analyse eines literarischen Entwurfs, WJA 27 (2003) 125–41.
- Isler-Kerényi, C., Dionysos in Archaic Greece: An Understanding through Images, Leiden 2007.
- Jacoby, F., The Date of Archilochos, CQ 35 (1941) 97–109.
- Jacoby, F., Kleine philologische Schriften I, Berlin 1961.
- Kahlmeyer, J., Seesturm und Schiffbruch als Bild im antiken Schrifttum, Hildesheim 1934 (Diss. Greifswald).
- Lasserre, F., Archiloque frg. 2 West, GB 8 (1979) 49–56.
- Lasserre, F. / A. Bonnard, Archiloque: Fragments. Texte établi par F. L., traduit et commenté par A. B., Paris 1958.
- Lavelle, B. M., The Apollodoran Date for Archilochus, CPh 97 (2002) 344–51.
- Lazzarini, M. L., I nomi dei vasi greci nelle iscrizioni dei vasi stessi, ArchClass 25–6 (1973–4) 340–75.
- Lissarrague, F., The Aesthetics of the Greek Banquet: Images of Wine and Ritual (Un Flot d'Images), Princeton (NJ) 1990 (a).
- Lissarrague, F., Around the Krater: An Aspect of Banquet Imagery, in: Murray 1990, 196–209 (b).
- Mingazzini, P., Spigolature vascolari, ASAA 45–6 (1969) 327–53.
- Mommmsen, H., Dionysos und sein Kreis im Werk des Exekias, Trierer Winkelmannsprogramme 20 (2002/2003, but 2005) 21–44.
- Monaco, G., De fragmento Archilochi 5A Diehl, AAPal 16 (1955–6) 185–91.
- Monaco, G., Nota archilochea, AandR 5 (1960) 19–22.
- Murgatroyd, P., The Sea of Love, CQ 45 (1995) 9–25.
- Murray, O. (Hrsg.), *Symptica. A Symposium on the Symposium*, Oxford 1990.
- Murray, O., War and the Symposium, in: Slater 1991, 83–103.
- Murray, O., Nestor's Cup and the Origin of the Greek Symposium, AION(archeol) 1 (1994) 47–54.
- Nicolosi, A., La frustrazione del guerriero in armi, ovvero il simposio negato (Archil. fr. 2 W.), *Prometheus* 31 (2005) 35–40.
- Nicolosi, A., Archiloco. Elegie, Bologna 2013.
- Nicolosi, A., Archiloco. Testimonianze e frammenti, Roma 2017

- Nikolaev, A., An Epic Party? Sober Thoughts on $\nu\eta\phi\acute{\epsilon}\mu\epsilon\nu$ (Archil. Fr. 4 W.²), *Philologus* 158 (2014) 10–25.
- Noussia, M., Solon's Symposium (frs. 32–4 and 36 Gentili-Prato² = 38–40 and 41 West²), *CQ* 51 (2001) 353–9.
- Obbink, D., [POxy] 4708. Archilochus, Elegies, in: *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri. Part LXIX*, London 2005, 18–42.
- Obbink, D., A New Archilochus Poem, *ZPE* 156 (2006) 1–9.
- Olson, S. D., *Aristophanes: Peace*, Oxford 1998.
- Page, D. L., Archilochus and the Oral Tradition, in: *Archiloque, Vandœuvres / Genève* 1964, 117–79.
- Pasquali, G., Archiloco, in: *Pagine meno stravaganti*, Firenze 1935, 91–111.
- Pavese, C. O., Arch. 2 T. = 2 W. $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ $\delta\omicron\pi\acute{\iota}$, in: L. Belloni / G. Milanese / A. Porro (Hrsg.), *Studia classica Iohanni Tarditi oblata*, Milano 1995, I 335–40.
- Perotti, P. A., Archiloco fr. 2 D., *GIF* 37 (1985) 223–31.
- Perrotta, G. / B. Gentili, Polinnia. Poesia greca arcaica, Messina / Firenze 1965.
- Podlecki, A. J., Three Greek Soldier-Poets: Archilochus, Alcaeus, Solon, *CW* 63 (1969) 73–81.
- Rankin, H. D., Archilochus fg. 2. D, fg. 7. (L-B), *Emerita* 40 (1972) 469–74.
- Reitzenstein, R., *Epigramm und Skolion. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der alexandrinischen Dichtung*, Giessen 1893.
- Roques, D., *Études sur la Correspondance de Synésios de Cyrène*, Bruxelles 1989.
- Rösler, W., *Dichter und Gruppe. Eine Untersuchung zu den Bedingungen und zur historischen Funktion früher griechischer Lyrik am Beispiel Alkaios*, München 1980.
- Rossi, L. E., Il simposio greco arcaico e classico come spettacolo a se stesso, in: *Spettacoli conviviali dall'antichità classica alle corti italiane del '400*, Viterbo 1983, 41–50.
- Rotstein, A., *The Idea of Iambos*, Oxford 2010.
- Russo, J., Reading the Greek Lyric Poets (Monodists), *Arion* 1 (1973–4) 707–30.
- Seeck, O., *Cerialis* (8), *RE* III 2 (1899) 1982.
- Seidensticker, B., Archilochus and Odysseus, *GRBS* 19 (1978) 5–22.
- Slater, W. J., Symposium at Sea, *HSCPh* 80 (1976) 161–70.
- Slater, W. J., Peace, the Symposium and the Poet, *ICS* 6 (1981) 206–14.
- Slater, W. J., Symptotic Ethics in the Odyssey, in: Murray 1990, 213–20.
- Slater, W. J., (Hrsg.), *Dining in a Classical Context*, Ann Arbor 1981.
- Sommerstein, A. H., *Aristophanes: Knights*, Warminster 1981.
- Stehle, E. M., *Performance and Gender in Ancient Greece: Nondramatic Poetry in its Setting*, Princeton (NJ) 1997.
- Steiner, D., Drowning Sorrows: Archilochus fr. 13 W. in its Performance Context, *GRBS* 52 (2012) 21–56.
- Swift, L. A., Archilochus the 'Anti-Hero'? Heroism, Flight and Values in Homer and the New Archilochus Fragment (P. Oxy. LXIX 4708), *JHS* 132 (2012) 139–55.
- Tarditi, G., *Archilochus*, Roma 1968.
- Tedeschi, G., L'elegia parentica-guerriera e il simposio. A proposito del fr. 1 W. di Callino, *RSC* 26 (1978) 203–9.
- Tedeschi, G., Il canto di Hybrias il Cretese. Un esempio di poesia conviviale, *QFC* 5 (1986) 53–74.
- Treu, M., *Archilochos*, München 1959.

- Ussher, R. G., *Aristophanes: Ecclesiazusae*, Oxford 1973.
- Vetta, M., (Hrsg.), *Poesia e simposio nella Grecia antica. Guida storica e critica*, Roma / Bari 1983.
- Vetta, M., Introduzione. *Poesia simposiale nella Grecia arcaica e classica*, in: Vetta 1983, XIII–LX (a).
- Vetta, M., *Aristofane: Le donne all'assemblea*, Milano 1994.
- Watson, L. C., *A Commentary on Horace's Epodes*, Oxford 2003.
- Webster, T. B. L., *Greek Art and Literature, 700–530 BC: The Beginnings of Modern Civilization*. London 1959.
- Wecowski, M., *When Did the Symposium Rise? Some Archaeological Considerations Regarding the Emergence of the Greek Aristocratic Banquet*, *Archaio-gnosia* 16 (2010–12) 19–48.
- Wecowski, M., *The Rise of the Greek Aristocratic Banquet*, Oxford 2014.
- West, M. L., *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus*, Berlin / New York 1974.
- West, M. L., *Hesiod: Works and Days*, Oxford 1978.

Roma

Massimo Giuseppetti