

# Drowning Sorrows: Archilochus fr.13 W. in its Performance Context

*Deborah Steiner*

κῆδεα μὲν στονόεντα Περικλέες οὔτε τις ἀστῶν  
μεμφόμενος θαλίης τέρψεται οὐδὲ πόλις·  
τοίους γὰρ κατὰ κῦμα πολυφλοίσβοιο θαλάσσης  
ἔκλυσεν, οἶδαλέους δ' ἀμφ' ὀδύνης ἔχομεν  
πνεύμονας. ἀλλὰ θεοὶ γὰρ ἀνηκέστοισι κακοῖσιν  
ὦ φίλ', ἐπὶ κρατερῆν τλημοσύνην ἔθεσαν  
φάρμακον. ἄλλοτε ἄλλος ἔχει τόδε· νῦν μὲν ἐς ἡμέας  
ἐτράπεθ', αἱματόεν δ' ἔλκος ἀναστένομεν,  
ἔξαυτίς δ' ἑτέρους ἐπαμείψεται. ἀλλὰ τάχιστα  
τλήτε, γυναικεῖον πένθος ἀπωσάμενοι.

Pericles, no citizen nor the city will find fault with our mournful grief when taking pleasure in festivities, such fine men did the wave of the loud-roaring sea wash down, and we have lungs swollen with pain. But yet the gods, my friend, for our incurable pains have set powerful endurance as an antidote; this one has at one time, and another at another; now it has turned to us, and we groan out at a bloody wound, but then again it will pass to others. Come, with all haste bear up, thrusting off womanish grief. (transl. Gerber, modified)

**A**LATE GEOMETRIC OINOCHOE in Munich dated to the last quarter of the eighth century shows a shipwreck:<sup>1</sup> a boat has overturned in a sea filled with fish and drowning men. Placed at the very midpoint of the scene, below the vessel spout, stands a lone figure still upright, quite probably Odysseus, clinging to the ship's keel while the rest of his com-

<sup>1</sup> Munich, Staatliche Antikensammlungen und Glyptothek, inv. 8696.

panions sink beneath the water.<sup>2</sup> As Robin Osborne's reading of the vase acutely notes, the painter has constructed a neat link between the image and the oinochoe's function in the context of the symposium for which it was designed; in perhaps the first extant instance of what became a commonplace equation between drunkenness and shipwreck, the vase positions the hero as the lone symposiast who has not succumbed to the "waves of drunkenness," the only one who is, quite literally, "left standing."<sup>3</sup> The principal purpose of this paper is straightforward: to demonstrate an instance of the same interchanges between the maritime and sympotic spheres in another work from the archaic period, this by a poet who, like the artist, brings two contexts—one drawn largely from the epic repertoire, the other from the drinking party in the here and now—into close relations, and in so doing, invites his audience to see two in one.

My discussion of Archilochus' fr.13 W. falls into three principal parts: section one briefly sets out the premises informing my account; section two proposes that the poem is centrally preoccupied with sympotic ethics and etiquette and draws on a series of hexameter texts so as to illustrate its engagement in an on-going and cross-generic discourse concerning not just the conduct of symposiasts (particularly where drinking mores are at issue) but also the role of song at the gathering; section three details the thematic polyvalence of the text, tracing the double frame of reference—one concerning loss at sea and its attendant suffering, the other prescriptions for behavior at the drinking party—that, in a manner also visible in the iconography of vessels designed for use at the symposium, its language and conceits are designed to call to mind. Overall, my interpretation aims to place the poem squarely back in its performative setting and to offer a reading that accommodates both the

<sup>2</sup> The identification as Odysseus, although frequently dismissed, has been most recently reasserted in J. M. Hurwit, "The Shipwreck of Odysseus: Strong and Weak Imagery in Late Geometric Art," *AJA* 115 (2011) 1–18.

<sup>3</sup> R. Osborne, *Archaic and Classical Greek Art* (Oxford 1998) 35.

ethics and practices of the sympotic occasion and the visual environment surrounding the audience listening to the song.

1. *Sympotic poetry in the early archaic age and generic concerns*

The extant fragments of Archilochus include a number of works generally described as “consolatory,” poems in which the speaker seems to exhort himself and/or an addressee to bear up under the throes of an affliction and the consequent grief. Plutarch expressly tells us that Archilochus composed fr.9 and 11 on the occasion of the death of his brother-in-law at sea (*Mor.* 23B, 33A–B), and several commentators suggest that the lines cited by Plutarch form part of a larger work that would have included fr.8–13. Previous discussions of these poems focus chiefly on two questions: are the compositions parts of a single whole, animated by the self-same somber impetus and mood? And what would have been the occasion for the delivery of such works?<sup>4</sup> It is Ewen Bowie’s answer to the second question in his influential article of 1986 that provides the starting point for the reading that I give fr.13 here.<sup>5</sup> Following Bowie’s demonstration that the only securely attested and much the most likely setting for the performance of Archilochus’ songs was the symposium (and that these fragments are consequently not “threnodic” or lamentatory, intended for a funerary context),<sup>6</sup> I suggest that, for all that it has conven-

<sup>4</sup> The chief and often very brief discussions include E. L. Bowie, “Early Greek Elegy, Symposium and Public Festival,” *JHS* 106 (1986) 13–35, at 1–2; A. P. Burnett, *Three Archaic Poets. Archilochus, Alcaeus, Sappho* (London 1983) 46–48, to whose more ample analysis my account is chiefly indebted; J. C. Kamerbeek, “Archilochea,” *Mnemosyne* IV 14 (1961) 1–15, at 1–3; D. L. Page, “Archilochus and the Oral Tradition,” in *Archiloque* (Vandoeuvres 1964) 117–164, at 126–128; M. Treu, *Archilochus* (Munich 1959) 167–171; F. R. Adrados, “L’Elegía a Pericles de Arquiloco,” *AFC* 6 (1953–54) 225–238, at 225–235.

<sup>5</sup> Bowie, *JHS* 106 (1986) 13–15.

<sup>6</sup> As Burnett notes (*Three Archaic Poets* 47), “this is no ordinary piece of consolation,” and cites Treu, *Archilochus* 167–171, on the absence of the usual threnetic topoi.

tionally been read as a strong-minded call on the speaker's part to set mourning aside, fr.13 also demonstrates all the self-reflexivity that we have come to expect from sympotic poetry (and pottery, with which, as I propose, the composition would closely interact) and claims a place within the larger tradition of songs that offer prescriptive and programmatic accounts of proper behavior at the drinking party, and the role of song therein.

Informing my argument are several broader assumptions, the first concerning Archilochus' deployment of and contributions to a contemporary discourse centered on "the decencies of eating and drinking" also visible in the hexameter repertoire of the early archaic age.<sup>7</sup> In aligning, and on occasion contrasting, the diction and themes of fr.13 with passages from Homer and Hesiod, I assume not that Archilochus consciously draws on these poets' works in the manner of intertexts (others have amply explored the problematic methodological premises on which such "intertextuality" depends in an age when an ongoing composition-in-performance tradition continued to shape and modify orally delivered songs),<sup>8</sup> but that we witness the several authors' parallel engagement with the same topic, viz. dining and wining, in their different co-existing and competing genres. Here my reading follows recent revisions of the teleological model assumed by earlier scholars, in which epic strictly preceded the lyric, iambic, and elegiac poetry of the later seventh and sixth centuries; according to the more current view, earlier forms of these genres would have circulated alongside

<sup>7</sup> The expression belongs to W. J. Slater, "Sympotic Ethics in the *Odyssey*," in O. Murray (ed.), *Sympotica: A Symposium on the Symposium* (Oxford 1990) 213–220, at 213.

<sup>8</sup> E.g. E. T. E. Barker and J. P. Christensen, "Fight Club: The New Archilochus Fragment and its Resonance with Homeric Epic," *MD* 57 (2006) 9–41, at 12–15, citing D. Fowler, "On the Shoulders of Giants," in *Roman Constructions. Readings in Postmodern Latin* (Oxford 2000) 115–135; note too M. Pavlou, "Metapoetics, Poetic Tradition, and Praise in Pindar *Olympian* 9," *Mnemosyne* 61 (2008) 533–567, at 536–538.

the Homeric compositions, with which they interacted in relations of exchange, opposition, and complementarity.<sup>9</sup> From this changed perspective, audiences of the archaic age would be familiar with a variety of “competing poetic traditions, which deploy a common store of words, phrases and motifs in different registers,”<sup>10</sup> and would be attuned to the ways in which the heterogeneous poetic forms would draw on this shared stock so as to make their compositions play against each.

Underpinning my use of the hexameter tradition by way of comparandum for the Parian poet’s song is a second modification in our view of epic poetry, this in regard to both its performative setting and its relations with other genres. Over the last two decades, scholars have been increasingly willing to grant Homer’s familiarity with the aristocratic symposium and to identify practices and *topoi* associated with the institution, now backdated at least into the last quarter of the eighth century,<sup>11</sup> in the scenes of feasting that the poet includes.<sup>12</sup> In a

<sup>9</sup> K. J. Dover, “The Poetry of Archilochus,” in *Archiloque* 181–212, offers an early discussion of the idea; see, more recently, G. Nagy, *Pindar’s Homer. The Lyric Possession of an Epic Past* (Baltimore 1990), and, for a forceful statement, A. Dalby, “Homer’s Enemies. Lyric and Epic in the Seventh Century,” in A. Powell (ed.), *The Greek World* (London 1995) 195–211, at 206. As J. van Sickle, “The New Erotic Fragment of Archilochus,” *QUCC* 20 (1975) 123–156, remarks of the relationship between melic poetry and epic, “each genre had its own ethos, form and function in society, which preceded and then coexisted with heroic epic rather than merely succeeding it and reacting against it.” He further raises “the possibility that an extraordinary flowering in one genre at some given moment might ... transform practice in the other genres” (154). Fueling this position too is the increasing tendency to downdate Homeric poetry; according to West’s arguments, the *Iliad* itself was not composed until the middle of the seventh century: “The Date of the *Iliad*,” *MusHelv* 52 (1995) 203–219, at 204, 218.

<sup>10</sup> Barker and Christensen, *MD* 57 (2006) 15, drawing on concepts developed in J. M. Foley, “Oral Tradition and its Implications,” in I. Morris and B. Powell (eds.), *A New Companion to Homer* (Leiden 1997) 146–173.

<sup>11</sup> See O. Murray, “Nestor’s Cup and the Origins of the Greek *Symposium*,” *AION(archeol)* n.s. 1 (1994) 47–54, for discussion.

<sup>12</sup> Most notably W. J. Slater, “Peace, the Symposium and the Poet,” *ICS*

recent discussion, Oswyn Murray makes a strong case for the *Odyssey* as a work expressly designed for delivery at the elite symposium and reads its undeniable preoccupation with banquets both idyllic and perverted as an early instance of the type of metasymphotic commentary on the performative occasion more typically associated with the songs of poets demonstrably composing for the drinking party.<sup>13</sup>

The oral character of Homeric and Hesiodic song and the ways in which performance settings shaped and modified the compositions through successive deliveries are also directly relevant to the material presented in section three, which argues both for the allusive character of sympotic poetry, and, a corollary to this, for its plasticity and the capacity for re-performance integral to compositions designed to circulate through time and space. From the earliest verse inscription included on a recognizably sympotic object, the Ischian kotyle known as Nestor's Cup and dated to the last quarter of the eighth century,<sup>14</sup> through to the classical age, poetry composed for this setting not only drew on its audience's familiarity with the co-existing hexameter repertoire, setting its own promotion of pleasure, love, and revelry in relation and opposition to the heroic and preeminently martial values that epic privileged, but

---

6 (1981) 205–214, and in *Sympotica* 213–220; A. Ford, “Odysseus after Dinner: *Od.* 9.2–11 and the Traditions of Sympotic Song,” in J. N. Kazazis and A. Rengakos (eds.), *Euphrosyne. Studies in Ancient Epic and its Legacy in Honor of Dimitris N. Maronitis* (Stuttgart 1999) 109–123, and *The Origins of Criticism. Literary Culture and Poetic Theory in Classical Greece* (Princeton 2002) 25–45; M. Węcowski, “Homer and the Origins of the Symposium,” in F. Montanari (ed.), *Omero tremila anni dopo* (Rome 2002) 625–637, and “Towards a Definition of the Symposium,” in T. Derda et al. (eds.), *Euergesias Charin. Studies presented to Benedetta Bravo and Ewa Wipszycka* (Warsaw 2002) 337–361; E. Irwin, *Solon and Early Greek Poetry* (Cambridge 2005) 43–45.

<sup>13</sup> O. Murray, “The *Odyssey* as Performance Poetry,” in M. Revermann and P. Wilson (eds.), *Performance, Iconography, Reception. Studies in Honour of Oliver Taplin* (Oxford 2008) 161–176.

<sup>14</sup> For this see Murray, *AION(archeol)* N.S. 1 (1994) 47–54.

exhibited what Richard Neer styles *ποικιλία*,<sup>15</sup> a capacity to encompass different meanings and to evoke disparate, often contrasting contexts and referents. This dimension of sympotic poetry has a practical end. Since no work too firmly anchored to a single moment, setting, or situation would be likely to be preserved and transmitted from one performer to the next, the poems were composed or modified through the course of oral transmission and circulation so as to accommodate other levels of meaning suited to subsequent singers, venues, and circumstances. Fr.13, whose terms can point simultaneously to heterogeneous realms of experience depending on the spirit and atmosphere of its performative milieu, proves a brilliant example of this *ποικιλία*, and of the wit and double play that characterized both words and visual images designed for the sympotic space.

## 2. *Sympotic tropes in epic and elegy*

First, what is the sentiment or stance endorsed in fr.13? Much depends on how we construe the perhaps deliberately ambiguous opening phrase, for which Kamerbeek proposes no fewer than three syntactically possible translations.<sup>16</sup> Recent readers choose the third:<sup>17</sup> far from indicating a renunciation of entertainment and festivity, the phrase, like that of fr.11 (“for neither shall I effect any healing by weeping, nor shall I make things worse by attending merry-making and banquets,” transl. Bowie), counsels leaving off from grief and a return to pleasure as usual. To cite Bowie’s paraphrase of the outlook that fr.13

<sup>15</sup> R. T. Neer, *Style and Politics in Athenian Vase Painting* (Cambridge 2002), esp. 9–26. While Neer’s chief concern is with the “two in one” character of sympotic pottery, he sees the quality of versatility and oscillation as typical of the poetry performed at the occasion. Also linking the two media, as Neer and others have shown, are the verbal/visual *griphoi* and puns that artists and poets include in their works.

<sup>16</sup> Kamerbeek, *Mnemosyne* IV 14 (1961) 1–15.

<sup>17</sup> Burnett, *Three Archaic Poets* 46; Bowie, *JHS* 106 (1986) 23; D. E. Gerber, *Greek Iambic Poetry* (Cambridge [Mass.] 1999) 88.

endorses, “again (as in *fr.* 11) Archilochus moves from recognition of a cause for grief to rejection of lamentation, and in so doing implies that banqueting is also of immediate concern,” an attitude very apposite to a poem for a sympotic occasion: no one wants a grief-monger at his party.<sup>18</sup> By anchoring *fr.* 13 in its context, Bowie’s remarks point the way towards the account developed here: that Archilochus’ lines offer their audience not just consolation, but introduce variations on a series of sympotic commonplaces that prescribe how the guest should conduct himself, what types of discourse are appropriate to the occasion, and what part wine and poetry should play so as to foster conviviality and good cheer.

With this context, concern, and the singer’s attitude in mind, I begin by taking a closer look at lines 5–7, where the poet declares to his friend Pericles, “for irremediable woes the gods have set powerful endurance as a *pharmakon*.” The language of both this and the surrounding lines finds its counterpart in an episode from the *Odyssey*, pertinent to Archilochus’ composition for both its setting and the viewpoint that it recommends. In Book 4, after the arrival of Telemachus and Peisistratus at the home of Menelaus in the midst of a wedding feast, the host indulges in a series of recollections that prompt tears all round. In diction closely comparable to the terms and sentiments in *fr.* 13, Menelaus first rehearses the deaths of those with whom he fought at Troy and his grief at their loss (100–103):

ἀλλ’ ἔμπηγς, πάντας μὲν ὀδυρόμενος καὶ ἀχεύων,  
πολλάκις ἐν μεγάροισι καθήμενος ἡμετέροισιν  
ἄλλοτε μὲν τε γόῳ φρένα τέρπομαι, ἄλλοτε δ’ αὖτε  
παύομαι· αἰψήρὸς δὲ κόρος κρυεροῖο γόοιο.

But, nevertheless, many times grieving and sorrowing while sitting in our halls I sometimes delight my heart in lamentation, and at another time again I stop. For suddenly there is surfeit of chilly lamentation.

He then goes on to recall Odysseus, who had cares or cause for

<sup>18</sup> Bowie, *JHS* 106 (1986) 23.



mourning (*κῆδεα*, 108) of his own, and whose unknown fate (most probably lost at sea)<sup>19</sup> offers fresh grounds for grief. Helen's subsequent entrance generates renewed talk of Odysseus, which elicits a second round of weeping.

If the mood were not sufficiently lacrimose, Peisistratus' own plangent story of the death of his surpassingly valiant brother at Troy augments the general gloom. But Nestor's son also seeks to return the company to a frame of mind more appropriate to the banquet that has gone off course (193–198):

πίθειό μοι· οὐ γὰρ ἐγὼ γε  
τέρπομ' ὀδυρόμενος μεταδόρπιος, ἀλλὰ καὶ Ἥως  
ἔσσεται ἠριγένεια· νεμεσσῶμαί γε μὲν οὐδὲν  
κλαίειν, ὅς κε θάνησι βροτῶν καὶ πότμον ἐπίσπη.  
τοῦτό νυ καὶ γέρας οἶον οἴζυροῖσι βροτοῖσι,  
κείρασθαί τε κόμην βαλέειν τ' ἀπὸ δάκρυ παρειῶν.

But hearken to me; for my part I take no pleasure in grieving in the middle of dinner;<sup>20</sup> and moreover early dawn will be here soon. Yet I can find no fault with tears for any mortal who dies and goes to his fate. This is, to be sure, the sole *geras* we pay to wretched mortals, to cut our hair and cast tears down our cheeks.

Fortified by the exhortation, Menelaus and his guests resume their interrupted feast, but with more than Peisistratus' admonition to restore the missing conviviality. Before a third set of reminiscences of Troy, Helen mixes into the wine a *φάρμακον*, the wonder-working drug that the poet terms *νηπενθές* and *κακῶν ἐπίληθον ἀπάντων* for its capacity to block sorrow

<sup>19</sup> See *Od.* 1.240–242.

<sup>20</sup> Although *μεταδόρπιος* is regularly assigned the meaning “in the middle of, during dinner” (but see *Od.* 4.68 and 213–214, which suggest that the meal has already occurred), in later sources—including Pind. fr.124ab.2 S.-M., this an explicitly sympotic text—the term means “after dinner.” Read this way, *μεταδόρπιος* would reinforce the Homeric passage's connection with the aristocratic symposium, the drinking party that properly occurred after the meal was done and tables cleared.

and grief (220–221).<sup>21</sup> Indeed, as the narrator explains, “whoever should drink it, once it has been mixed into the *krater*, would not on that day let a tear fall down his cheeks, not even if his mother and father were dead or if men murdered a brother or a beloved son in his presence” (222–226). Already implicit is the foregrounding of the sympotic site: Helen’s antidote does not operate just anywhere, but must be “mixed into” the bowl from which all symposiasts drink, the *krater* that is the central object in the sympotic space.<sup>22</sup>

Fr.13 maps very closely onto this Odyssean episode. In both instances we are in the context of a feast and on each occasion grief for stalwart men (*τοίους* in Archilochus) who have died, whether through warfare, murder, or drowning at sea, threatens to cast a pall over what should be a joyful event. Just as Peisistratus acknowledges that there is nothing to censure in the act of mourning (indeed, since this is the only *geras* that the dead receive, no one could find fault with it), but owns that he takes no pleasure in the activity while engaged in feasting, particularly with dawn pressing on, so Archilochus’ speaker moves from a declaration of the blameless character of grieving to proposing that his interlocutors put mourning aside and recover a mood suited to the sympotic event. But here the elegiac lines take a rather different turn: in place of the mourning practices cited by Menelaus’ guest, Archilochus suggests a remedy for the grief of those left behind much closer to hand, a *pharmakon* belonging to the immediate occasion and that has a striking affinity with the antidote that Helen administers (and the final line of fr.13, with its exhortation to thrust off *πένθος*, resembles the “*πένθος*-obviating” nature of Helen’s drug). Perhaps signaling his departure from the epic tenor of much of the poem’s vocabulary, turns of phrase, and syntactical constructions,<sup>23</sup>

<sup>21</sup> I return to this drug in section 3.

<sup>22</sup> See F. Lissarrague, “Around the *Krater*: An Aspect of Banquet Imagery,” in *Sympotica* 196–209, for this.

<sup>23</sup> Conveniently identified by D. A. Campbell, *Greek Lyric Poetry* (Bristol 1982) 146–147.

Archilochus uses for the novel remedy a word unparalleled in Homeric diction, *τλημοσύνην*.<sup>24</sup>

A closer look at the context in which Homer introduces one among the other expressions that he and Archilochus share reveals additional exchanges and freshly demonstrates the two poets' cross-generic engagement with a topic of contemporary concern. The seemingly formulaic *κῆδεα ... στονόεντα* of fr. 13's opening line parallels the phrase that actually occurs only once in Homer, in the verse that follows immediately on the celebrated sympotic passage at the start of Book 9,<sup>25</sup> whose lines 2–11 find an echo in so much later poetry composed for the drinking party.<sup>26</sup> Odysseus is the speaker here, and the setting another feast, the sumptuous banquet at Alcinous' court.<sup>27</sup> Praising his host, the hero celebrates the delights of this superlative entertainment. As he then prepares to launch into the tale of his misfortunes, Odysseus remarks, "but the spirit in you was moved to inquire into my mournful sorrows (*κῆδεα ... στονόεντα*), so that I may grieve and groan (*ὄδυρόμενος στεναχίζω*) still more" (12–13).<sup>28</sup> What had, in the first instance, aroused Odysseus' sorrowing and Alcinous' subsequent inquiry was Demodocus' song about the Trojan horse and the attack it instigated, a performance that moved the hero copi-

<sup>24</sup> Burnett, *Three Archaic Poets* 48, observes the novelty of the term.

<sup>25</sup> For discussion see Slater, in *Sympotica* 213–220; Ford, in *Euphrosyne* 109–123; Irwin, *Solon and Early Greek Poetry* 126–128.

<sup>26</sup> E.g., Theogn. 255–256, 1063–1068; Anacr. *Eleg.* 2 W.

<sup>27</sup> As commentators frequently note, the banqueting scenes in Books 4 and 8–9 form a pair as the later passages rework and augment the language and tropes rehearsed in the "anticipatory doublet" in Menelaus' palace.

<sup>28</sup> These lines also re-echo in later reflections on the proper conduct of the symposium; see particularly Plutarch *Mor.* 630E who cites the *Odyssey* passage and notes, "it is therefore necessary to keep one's questions away from the subject of misfortunes, for it distresses people to speak of lawsuits lost, of children buried, of any unsuccessful business-deals on land or sea. But they are glad to be asked over and over how ... when others fell in with storms or pirates, they themselves avoided the danger."

ously to weep in the manner of a woman (*ὡς δὲ γυνή κλαίῃσι*, 8.523) lamenting the death of her husband fallen in war.

If, in keeping with Slater's reading of the sequence of banqueting scenes occupying *Odyssey* 8,<sup>29</sup> Homer presents the episodes in which Demodocus entertains the Phaeacian revelers with epic-style songs as fallings off from the sympotic ideal, then Archilochus avoids the mistake made by the fictitious bard. Where Demodocus' performances featured the very topics of warfare and strife that would be banished by Xenophanes, Anacreon, and Ibycus from the repertoire of poetry suitable for the symposium<sup>30</sup> and in so doing derailed the pleasure of at least one among the guests, the Parian poet forestalls an Odysseus-like response, this styled a *γυναικεῖον πένθος* in the fragment's final line, and nicely satisfies Alcinous' admonitory brief: that the singer should perform something that causes *terpsis* in hosts and guests, "pleasing all alike" (*πάντεσσι χαριζόμενος*, 8.538–542).<sup>31</sup> And while Odysseus' speech at the start of Book 9 threatens renewed (self)-wretchedness in his calamity-filled tale and risks a fresh departure from the mood of festive pleasures that Alcinous is trying to promote, the lyric poet counsels abandoning "mournful sorrows" and groans, and, by eschewing the non-sympotic subject matter that Demodocus' song exemplified, restores the *terpsis* that the occasion ideally affords. In this "puff" for the composition that he now presents, the singer effectively caps and corrects his hexameter rivals—not just Demodocus, but even that master *aidos* Odysseus too.

After mention of the *pharmakon*, Archilochus' diction takes a surprising turn, and with the "bloody wound" (6) at which the speaker and his friend "groan out," the poet introduces a

<sup>29</sup> Slater, in *Sympotica* 217–219. My account somewhat modifies Slater's argument.

<sup>30</sup> Xenophanes fr.1 W., Anacr. *Eleg.* 2 W., Ibycus fr.282 *PMG*.

<sup>31</sup> Note too that Alcinous closes his speech in Book 8 by commenting that Odysseus must be weeping for the loss of a goodly *hetairos* (584–586), just as Archilochus' audience is doing.

distinctly martial note.<sup>32</sup> Together this sanguinary injury and the subsequent application of a therapeutic *pharmakon* evoke a scene repeated on several occasions in the Iliadic repertoire, in which a hero (or god) is struck by a missile on the field of battle and then healed by the drugs that a doctor places on the wound so as to staunch the flow of blood. By way of precedent for the compound verb ἐπιτίθημι used of the gods “setting” or “applying” endurance as a remedy for men’s incurable ills, Campbell cites *Il.* 4.190–191 where, in an attempt to console the wounded Menelaus, Agamemnon assures his brother that “the doctor will handle the wound and set upon it *pharmaka* which might put a stop to the black pains” (ἔλκος δ’ ἰητῆρ ἐπιμάσσειται ἦδ’ ἐπιθήσει / φάρμαχ’ ἃ κεν παύσῃσι μελαινάων ὀδυνάων).<sup>33</sup> The healer Machaon is summoned, and duly sucks out the blood before healing the injury with his medicinal substances (218).

With the introduction of the sphere of battle so native to the *Iliad* and other works in the hexameter tradition, fr.13 offers a skillful juxtaposition of two very different and contrasting contexts: on the one hand the belligerence and conflict that martial epic celebrates, on the other the concerns of the symposium that bear directly on the occasion of the song’s performance. This intercalation of two worlds that, with the signal exception of the scenes in which the hero of the *Odyssey* wreaks his bloody revenge on the suitors feasting in his hall, Homeric poetry largely keeps apart—battlefield polemics and symposia—and the import of the language and tropes of warfare to the site of the drinking party not only conforms to the broader practice of Archilochus and later sympotic poets, who fold military vocabulary, settings, and objects into the dining

<sup>32</sup> Cf. Burnett, *Three Archaic Poets* 48.

<sup>33</sup> Note that the Achaean companions of Agamemnon and Menelaus are “groaning out” at the event (154), and that, of all the arrow wounds in the poem, this one alone produces so effusive a blood flow that the poet even devotes an extended simile to it when the missile first strikes (141–145).

space and use martial diction for the experience of the symposiasts, themselves engaged, in the conceits the poems deploy, in their own forms of “battle”;<sup>34</sup> it also gives to fr.13 its multi-layered quality, where several frames of reference coexist. As the third part of my discussion shows, this “double-valence”<sup>35</sup> proves critical to the larger meaning of the song.

But first one final hexameter passage that addresses a theme also central to fr.13 and that, like Archilochus’ poem, may offer an early instance of reflection on the proper role of poetry at the symposium. Lines 7–10 of the elegiac song involve a certain logical discontinuity with what came before. While remedies are, by nature, “remedial,” in this instance the drug that the speaker prescribes works more as *apotropaion* than as cure. The bloody wound is not, as in the Iliadic episode, actually healed by the antidote; instead what Burnett identifies as the external manifestation of the suffering of the drowned, which is subsequently “transferred to the living and then ... transformed, as the visceral inner pain is brought outside the survivors’ bodies and made into a wound that can be healed,”<sup>36</sup> is passed on to others.<sup>37</sup> But what (unspecified) mechanism brings this transfer about? As Burnett’s reading makes clear,<sup>38</sup> fr.13 is performative insofar as the delivery of the song mimetically effects the action that its words describe, leaving the singer and audience free from their earlier sorrow and able to enjoy the festive delights

<sup>34</sup> For good discussion of this conceit in sympotic poetry, see Irwin, *Solon and Early Greek Poetry*, esp. 47–48.

<sup>35</sup> I borrow the expression from Neer, *Style and Politics* 49.

<sup>36</sup> Burnett, *Three Archaic Poets* 48; note however, in a problem that section three takes up, that this wound is described only with the vague *τόδε* at line 7 whose actual referent is left unclear.

<sup>37</sup> Burnett, *Three Archaic Poets* 48, comments: “It must be noted, however, that this *pharmakon* is in no sense an anodyne: it does not soothe, but is instead a harsh medicine designed only for recovery. The mourner is to stanch the blood and return to action.”

<sup>38</sup> Burnett, *Three Archaic Poets* 47, although in an argument rather different from that presented here.

at hand. The missing element in the sequence that Archilochus describes, I suggest following Burnett's lead, is the poem itself, which permits grief's passage from one set of individuals to the next. In a neatly self-promoting move, the catalyst within the sequence that fr.13 describes—the shift from the curative to the apotropaic—is thus nothing other than the performance of the poem that simultaneously advocates, describes, and constitutes (one part of, as later argued) the remedy that the gods have supplied, a *pharmakon* that both heals and “turns aside.”

That song itself should play a role in fr.13's “pharmacology” would come as no surprise to an audience familiar with the powers also ascribed to poetry in the hexameter tradition, and that, very appositely, are also closely bound up with Helen's drug in the sympotic episode in *Od.* 4 discussed above.<sup>39</sup> Not only, as readers since antiquity have noted, does the Spartan queen's *pharmakon* take the form both of a drug and of the *muthos* that Helen goes on to narrate,<sup>40</sup> but Homer's description of the workings of the antidote corresponds to a striking degree to the account of the grief-dispelling nature of poetry in Hesiod

<sup>39</sup> Note G. Nagy, *The Best of the Achaeans* (Baltimore 1979) 94–192, for the nature of *πένθος*; according to his argument, it is specifically *kleos* as realized through the medium of oral poetry that can remedy grief. A. L. T. Bergren, “Helen's ‘Good Drug’: Odyssey IV 1–305,” in S. Kresic (ed.), *Contemporary Literary Hermeneutics and Interpretation of Classical Texts* (Ottawa 1981) 201–214, at 207, develops his argument: “Helen's drug is, then, like *kleos*. It is so effective an antidote to pain that at the tragedy of your family, you would sense only glory and would not weep. With this drug Helen will supply what the banquet has lacked heretofore, re-presentation of the past without pain. For just as she adds a ‘good drug’ with the power of *kleos*, so she will now add a speech with the properties of her *pharmakon*.”

<sup>40</sup> So Plut. *Mor.* 614B–C (note too the earlier part of the passage, also very relevant to Archilochus' lines): “Now those who mix alkanet in their wine and sprinkle their floors with infusions of vervain and maidenhair because, as they believe, these things to some extent contribute to the cheerfulness and gaiety of their guests, do so in imitation of Homer's Helen, who secretly added a drug to the undiluted wine; but they do not see that the legend too ... has its end in the telling of appropriate and suitable stories” (transl. Clement). See too Macrobian *Sat.* 7.1.18.

*Theog.* 98–103, a passage whose diction and conceits find several echoes in fr.13. As Hesiod observes (with the terms also deployed by Archilochus underlined):

εἰ γάρ τις καὶ πένθος ἔχων νεοκηδέει θυμῷ  
 ἄζηται κραδίην ἀκαχήμενος, αὐτὰρ ἀοιδὸς  
 Μουσάων θεράπων κλεῖα προτέρων ἀνθρώπων  
 ὑμνήσει μάκαράς τε θεοὺς οἳ Ὀλυμπον ἔχουσιν,  
 αἴψ' ὃ γε δυσφροσυνέων ἐπιλήθεται οὐδέ τι κηδέων  
 μέμνηται· ταχέως δὲ παρέτραπε δῶρα θεάων.

Even if someone having sorrow in his newly-afflicted spirit parches his heart with grieving, yet when a poet, attendant of the Muses, sings of the famed deeds of former men and the blessed gods who possess Olympus, straight off he forgets his sorrows and does not remember his cares at all; for quickly the gifts of the gods have turned them aside.

The kinship between the hexameter and elegiac lines does not, as already noted, so much indicate Archilochus' intertextual dependence on Hesiod as suggest that concerns with sympotic ideology may already be visible in the Boeotian poet. Where in the passage immediately preceding Hesiod's celebration of the *oidos* we witness kings deploying their gifts of persuasive rhetoric so as to settle disputes in the agora, the introduction of the bard after this could involve a relocation to the more private dining space. Indeed, the terms selected by Hesiod seem particularly evocative of this second site, and of a sympotic-style gathering. If the *εὐφροσύνη* cited in Odysseus' famous enumeration of the joys that banqueting ideally affords at *Od.* 9.6 is already the *vox propria* for sympotic pleasures (cf. Xenophan. fr.1.4), then *δυσφροσύνη* at *Theog.* 102 forms its antonym and constitutes the sentiment most ill-suited to a gathering where grieving and cares (*πένθος ἔχων νεοκηδέει θυμῷ*) are out of place. In a variation on the link already visible in the Odyssean scene where Helen's misery-obviating drug/ story is interjected into the wine, the bard's therapeutic song is similarly bound up (in a pairing to which section three returns) with the liquid no



less central to the occasion. As West argues,<sup>41</sup> the verb ἄζηται at line 99 vividly describes how πένθος “dries out” or “parches” an individual or one of his organs. How better to remedy this desiccation than with the potion of wine, a substance typically celebrated for being as “sweet” and “flowing” (γλυκερή, ῥέει, 97) as the singing voice that Hesiod has described in the line prefacing this passage?

But just as fr.13 sounds variations on sympotic topoi apparent in Homeric poetry, so too Archilochus sets his generic stamp on the diction used by Hesiod to articulate these dining-hall concerns. While both poets promote the diversionary powers of (sympotic) poetry,<sup>42</sup> for the Boeotian poet the performance of the bard prompts forgetfulness, a condition that picks up on his earlier representation of the power of the Muses, whose mother grants “a forgetfulness of evils and repose from anxieties” (λημοσύνην τε κακῶν ἄμπαυμά τε μερμηράων, 55). In Archilochus’ account, by contrast, the remedy for grief is not amnesia, λημοσύνη, but the very different, although virtually homonymous, quality τλημοσύνη, itself a cure of the woes and cares also cited in the *Theogony*. As though to call attention to the innovation and departure from the tradition-honed vocabulary of hexameter poetry within his elegiac lines, the poet then goes on neatly to reveal the parallel between the drug and song that was also integral to Helen’s intervention in the *Odyssey*: the term τλήτε in Archilochus’ final line echoes the expression τλημοσύνην used of the medicine, with the singer’s re-vocalization of the remedy serving almost in the manner of an incantation to reinforce its efficacy. In a gesture that realizes the promise of fr.1, where Archilochus declares himself, in a phrase one half of which deploys the expression

<sup>41</sup> M. L. West, *Hesiod. Theogony* (Oxford 1966) ad loc.

<sup>42</sup> On the diversionary aspect of song, see the discussion of the Hesiodic term in P. Pucci, *Hesiod and the Language of Poetry* (Baltimore 1977) 17–18. Note too that in the Hesiodic account the repertoire performed by the singer accommodates the “famed deeds of former men,” presumably their battlefield heroics.

used by Hesiod at *Theog.* 100 (*Μουσάων θεράπων*), both the “attendant of Muses, and skilled in their lovely gift,” the poet has become the medium through which the divine bequest to men is channeled.

### 3. *Drowning and drinking*

In all existing readings of fr.13, and prompted in no small part by Plutarch’s remarks concerning the poet’s loss of his brother-in-law at sea by way of preface to his citation of fr.9,<sup>43</sup> scholars have taken Archilochus’ language at surface value, assuming that the speaker and his companion are indeed sorrowing over men who have perished in the waves. While there is nothing implausible in the notion that a seventh-century poet composed a song of consolation for a drinking party following a local maritime disaster, there are several reasons, both internal and external to fr.13, for modifying this assumption and for seeing the sympotic concerns identified above as no less central to the lines. First, as already noted, because sympotic poetry is designed to accommodate re-performances before different audiences at other sites, poets composing for the milieu tend to avoid what is too situation-specific. And second, when read together with patterns of imagery common in other sympotic songs, and with the fragment’s milieu as well as the poetic parallels detailed above in mind, the language and tropes of fr.13 turn out to possess levels of significance very different from those that commentators have assigned to them.

To anticipate my argument, then, the remedy/consolation that fr.13 proposes turns out to be not just the song that the symposiast now performs but, in a “metasympotic” move that freshly mirrors the setting for the piece, the wine whose consumption, impact, and circuit Archilochus’ protocol-laden and prescriptive language traces out. By including in his song abundant references to the activity that is common to all the occasions, present and future, on which his lines might be performed, and in which any audience would inevitably share,

<sup>43</sup> Cf. the remark of Tzetzes on fr.215.

Archilochus expands his work's therapeutic scope, making it relevant to each and every sympotic gathering where a recent sorrow or bereavement stands in pleasure's way. Indeed, the song has a still broader reach: through its mimetic re-enactment of a scenario of recent loss and its presentation of grief as a foil to the social potential of sympotic performance and drinking, it promotes the institution as a remedy not just for pain, but for the dysfunction that can extend from the drinking party to the polis at large. If this is the broader purpose of fr. 13, then the conduct of symposiasts naturally forms a central concern, and nowhere more than in the question of how they handle the drink that is the *sine qua non* of the occasion.<sup>44</sup>

First, the internal evidence that the song is composed with an eye to re-performance and has built into it the versatility and capacity for movement through time and space that such iteration requires. Here I borrow a notion from Egbert Bakker who draws attention to the types of statements that discourse linguistics identifies as "indexicals";<sup>45</sup> these are phrases containing demonstrative or deictic elements like *I, you, now, this, that*, etc. What distinguishes these terms from the regular round of referential expressions is that "they come to designate anything or anyone specific only in the concrete context of utterance, when the 'I' is the speaker that the addressee is actually listening to, the 'now', the actual moment when the verbal transaction takes place." In statements designed to be re-performed, "the indexicality of the phrase, its inbuilt 'hereness' and 'nowness', is projected. Whoever utters, performs, it will complement its referentiality with respect to the new context of utterance." Bakker sees the presence of these elements as a hallmark of archaic poetry that seeks a panhellenic rather than

<sup>44</sup> See n.65 below.

<sup>45</sup> E. J. Bakker, "Theognis: the Seal and the Audience" (forthcoming, Leiden Brill); his "Homer, Odysseus, and the Narratology of Performance," in J. Grethlein and A. Rengakos (eds.), *Narratology and Interpretation. The Content of Narrative Form in Ancient Literature* (Berlin/New York 2009) 117–136, at 123, presents much the same account.

a single, local audience. His description nicely conforms to what we see in fr.13: in contrast to many other fragments of Archilochus, which do contain localisms (e.g. fr.21, 22, 102, 116),<sup>46</sup> this song has nothing that would anchor it to a specific site, while the profusion of indexicals makes emphatic its ‘hereness’ and ‘nowness’: *τοίους* in line 3, the address to the companion in 6, *τόδε* in 7, and the phrase at 7–8. Nor is the name Pericles at the poem’s start a stumbling block to this approach; it would be easy enough to substitute a different isometric name for this, or, more likely, Pericles, who appears on a number of occasions in Archilochus (so fr.16, 124a), could function in the manner of a *sphragis*, much as Cynrus does in Theognis;<sup>47</sup> the presence of the name declares that this is a work by Archilochus, with all the associations that speaking in the Parian poet’s (symptotic) persona carry.

Now to the broader notion or situation that frames the work, the death by drowning of individuals whom the “wave ... washed down” (3–4). As Slater, Bowie, Davies, and Lissarrague richly document,<sup>48</sup> the sea is ubiquitous in symptotic poetry and in the iconography and realia of the occasion. According to the language of their songs (as well as in their conduct), drinkers at the party regularly imagine themselves at sea, whether on board ship, or already shipwrecked and in the waves. Much cited are the lines from a fragment by the early fifth-century

<sup>46</sup> See E. L. Bowie, “Wandering Poets, Archaic Style,” in R. L. Hunter and I. Rutherford (eds.), *Wandering Poets in Ancient Greek Culture: Travel, Locality and Pan-Hellenism* (Cambridge 2009) 107–110.

<sup>47</sup> Cf. Bowie, *JHS* 106 (1986) 14: “Theognis’ technique of regularly addressing songs to a named individual, although it tells an informed audience that the songs are his, does not tie their content so closely to Theognis as would the regular use of his own name. Contemporaries will have had little difficulty in singing a song addressed to Cynrus.”

<sup>48</sup> W. J. Slater, “Symposium at Sea,” *HSCP* 80 (1976) 161–170; M. Davies, “Sailing, Rowing and Sporting in one’s Cup on the Wine-Dark Sea,” in W. Childs (ed.), *Athens Comes of Age: From Solon to Salamis* (Princeton 1978) 72–95; Bowie, *JHS* 106 (1986) 13–15; F. Lissarrague, *The Aesthetics of the Greek Banquet. Images of Wine and Ritual* (Princeton 1990) 107–122.

elegiac poet Dionysius Chalcus, who describes symposiasts as “bringing wine in the rowing of Dionysus, sailors of the symposium and oarsmen of cups” (fr.5 W.), and many works sound variations on the theme. As Davies comments,<sup>49</sup> and as the oinochoe cited at my discussion’s start already illustrates, the nautical conceit “clearly extended to the condition of drunkenness,” which was imagined according to the model—as it still is today—of shipwreck and submersion beneath the waves. So in Euripides’ *Cyclops*, the inebriated Polyphemus remarks “I’ve barely managed to swim out” (577), this after declaring himself “loaded as to my hull, like a cargo ship” (505); a corrupt and rather puzzling fragment of Choerilus of Samos deploys the same motif, equating the “shard of a broken cup” with “the shipwrecked remnants of feasting men, such as a gale of Dionysus casts forth upon the shores of hybris” (fr.9 Bernabé); and a character in a comedy of Xenarchus remarks of the cup from which the third libation at the symposium was poured, “And that cup of Zeus Soter very quickly wrecked and sank me, the sailor, as you see” (fr.2 K.-A.).

That Archilochus is thoroughly acquainted with the motif several of the extant fragments demonstrate. In fr.2 and 4, the poet imagines himself drinking, and, in fr.4, getting drunk, while seemingly at sea.<sup>50</sup> As Bowie shows,<sup>51</sup> both songs (which may belong to a single composition) more properly describe the situation of symposiasts, with the participle *κεκλιμένος* that concludes fr.2 serving to evoke the participant in the drinking party, who consumes his choice Ismarian wine reclining not on board ship, but on a couch in the comfort of the *andrôn*. So too fr.4, whose reference to the “benches” (*σέλματα*) of the rowers

<sup>49</sup> Davies, in *Athens Comes of Age* 77.

<sup>50</sup> Fr.2: *ἐν δορὶ μὲν μοι μᾶζα μεμαγμένη, ἐν δορὶ δ’ οἶνος / Ἴσμαρικός· πίνω δ’ ἐν δορὶ κεκλιμένος*. Fr.4: *ἀλλ’ ἄγε σὺν κώθωνι θοῆς διὰ σέλματα νηὸς / φοίτα καὶ κοίλων πώματ’ ἄφελκε κάδων, / ἄγρει δ’ οἶνον ἐρυθρὸν ἀπὸ τρυγός· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἡμεῖς / νηφέμεν ἐν φυλακῇ τῆδε δυνησόμεθα*.

<sup>51</sup> Bowie, *JHS* 106 (1986) 17–18.

through which the cup-bearer must pass may similarly be a play on sympotic couches,<sup>52</sup> matches up less with soldiers standing guard while on a ship beached somewhere, than with drinkers engaged in a common sympotic game that required inebriated symposiasts to keep their balance while performing a variety of dexterity-demanding acts.<sup>53</sup>

These nautical allusions, and the sensation of being “at sea” would be promoted and reinforced by the drinking cups and mixing bowls produced for the event.<sup>54</sup> These not only are decorated with a wealth of maritime motifs, but several share their names with kinds of ships and can take the form of boats which “sail” around the sympotic company (and are even sunk in one form of the kottabos game). Like the poets, although fashioning their connections through pictorial space and painterly technique rather than through simile and metaphor, artists conflate the symposium and maritime spheres, sometimes placing Dionysus on board ship amid drinking vessel and vines, sometimes decorating one portion of their vessel with a ship and seascape, the other with a drinking party. A lost black-figure amphora shows a symposium on its exterior, and ships

<sup>52</sup> This use of maritime language by way of conceit and metaphor occurs elsewhere in Archilochus: the seascapes, ships, rigging, waves, and storms to which his poetry refers are as often as not (as far as we, following the ancient commentators who cite the works, can discern) notional, not real, images and tropes that, as in other elegiac and lyric poets, refer to quite different situations. Heraclitus, citing fr.105 in his *Homeric Allegories*, classifies the lines as allegorical: “in exactly this way Archilochus, embroiled in Thracian troubles, likens the war to a storm at sea.” Fr.106, which expands on the maritime metaphor, may form the sequel to those lines. On fr.212 see too Gerber, *Greek Iambic Poetry* 225, “possibly imagery for a critical situation.”

<sup>53</sup> For these see Lissarrague, *Aesthetics of the Greek Banquet* 76–80.

<sup>54</sup> In the re-performance scenario assumed here, the late sixth and early fifth-century date assigned to many of these vessels does not pose problems. We have ample evidence, particularly from Attic comedy, for the circulation and performance of Archilochus’ songs at Athenian symposia of the classical period.

inside,<sup>55</sup> and a cup in London of ca. 490 offers a similar arrangement, with scenes of drinking and revelry on its two sides, while ships and dolphins surround the tondo where a youth with the same amphora depicted on both external faces appears.<sup>56</sup> Indeed, this second object, which reserves the black-figure technique for the maritime scene while red-figure is used for the revelers, offers a pictorial instance of the *homonymia*<sup>57</sup> or “double-meaning” similarly deployed by Archilochus in his songs. While the different color schemes mark out the seemingly separate spheres, the individual elements in each scene invite viewers to bring the different spaces into close relations; not only does the black background surrounding the youth in the innermost image then become the sea on which the ships in the framing zone sail, but the dancing dolphins recapitulate the shape of the pointed amphoras in the interior and on the cup’s two sides. As Beth Cohen notes, the vessel depicted in the tondo must be filled with wine—the youth visibly struggles to raise it by its handles; when wine similarly fills the cup, the amphora’s contents quite literally become the medium on which the painted ships sail and dolphins caper, realizing the Homeric conceit of the “wine-dark sea.” Indeed, the symposiast drinking from the cup would experience the conflation of the two milieus, viewing in rapid succession first the drinkers, then the seascape, and then the youth and amphora.

A second vessel still more completely merges the symposium with a seascape. On a red-figure psykter in London by Douris from ca. 490–480,<sup>58</sup> satyrs perform a variety of balancing acts using wine cups and other sympotic vessels. While most of the

<sup>55</sup> Beazley archive no. 9017989; Immerwahr, *CAVI* 4853.

<sup>56</sup> British Museum GR 1843.11–3.92; *ARV<sup>2</sup>* 225.1, 1636; my reading draws on B. Cohen, *The Colors of Clay: Special Techniques in Athenian Vases* (Los Angeles 2006) 41–42. For additional examples see Lissarrague, *Aesthetics of the Greek Banquet* 107–122.

<sup>57</sup> Neer, *Style and Politics* 35.

<sup>58</sup> British Museum, E768; *ARV<sup>2</sup>* 446.262.

figures are still upright, one reveler is recumbent, his two palms placed on the decorative ground line while his companions pour wine into his upturned mouth, one from an oinochoe, the other from a wine skin. Both this satyr's posture and the feats of athleticism that the others perform take on fresh meaning when the psykter is placed inside the wine-filled vessel it serves to cool. With the liquid reaching up to the baseline on which the satyrs are arranged, they literally float on the unstable medium, their wine-fueled revelry transposed to this maritime setting. The individual performing a handstand over the wine cup now looks as though he is preparing to dive into the drink on which that cup would appear to bob, while the figure in the reclining posture risks sinking further beneath the "sea" as he consumes more and more of the contents of the askos and pitcher. So too the mirroring satyr on the other side may soon disappear beneath the liquid medium as fresh quantities of wine are poured into the vessel balanced on his upright phallos.

My suggestion, then, is that fr.13 follows this same "homonymous" practice, and that, performed at the symposium, it draws together and coordinates its two-fold concerns: intercalated with the psychic-cum-physical suffering of the company and its necessary renunciation of grief is the act of drinking which can both promote empathy with the deceased and, correctly conducted, bring about the change of mood that the song advocates. An objection to this reading immediately suggests itself: unlike the passages cited so far, fr.13 never mentions drinking or the wine so basic to the maritime conceit. But, following the lead of the oinochoe cited at my discussion's start, which invites the symposiasts to supply the link between the wine poured from the jug and the shipwreck scene, there are at least three grounds, over and above the activity in which the performer's audience would be engaged, for seeing drink as integral to fr.13 and as the "missing piece" towards which the singer keeps wittily directing his audience's thoughts: the hexameter passages that engage in the same sympotic discourse, later readings of the song in antiquity, and, most importantly, the bivalent language that Archilochus selects.



First, the epic passages which, as earlier proposed, introduce scenarios closely comparable to that described in fr.13, and which give wine a central place. In Book 4 of the *Odyssey*, the drink served to the company is the medium for ingesting the drug, and the substance with which the *pharmakon* is mixed (*μυγείη*, 222). Indeed, the poet's language suggests the kinship between the drink and the medicinal substance added to it: the "mingled" (*μεμιγμένα*, 230) character of Helen's drugs recapitulates the already mixed nature of the contents of the bowl, now with a third compound element to be combined with the wine and water blend. In Book 9, the wine cited as a component of the feast is postponed till the last and privileged position in the list of sympotic pleasures and amplified by expansion (9–10).<sup>59</sup> Noted above was the suggestive *ἄζηται* used by Hesiod at *Theog.* 99 and other terms in the surrounding lines that spanned the registers of wine and poetry.

Second, there are the retrospective readings that fr.13, and the like-minded fr.11, received in antiquity, and that also promote wine to center stage. In verses that, as Burnett has noted,<sup>60</sup> closely echo the language and themes of Archilochus' song, Alcaeus declares to his sympotic company and to his aptly named *hetairos* in particular, "we should not surrender our spirit to evils, for we shall make no headway by grieving, Bychis; the best of antidotes is for men to bring wine and get drunk" (*οὐ χρῆ κάκοισι θυμόν ἐπιτρέπην / προκόψομεν γὰρ οὐδὲν ἀσάμενοι / ὦ Βύκχι, φαρμάκων δ' ἄριστον / οἶνον ἐνειαμένους μεθύσθην*, fr.335 V.). While Burnett suggests a deliberate parody of the earlier poem here, I would read Alcaeus' lines as articulating what is already latent or conspicuous for its absence in Archilochus' song: the obvious antidote for sorrow is not abstract endurance, but wine, whose pharmaceutical

<sup>59</sup> The Iliadic arrow shots discussed above might not be irrelevant here; Pind. fr.124ab.11, a patently sympotic song, describes "wits subdued by the arrows of the vine" (*φρένας ἀμπελίνους τόξοις δαμέντες*).

<sup>60</sup> Burnett, *Three Archaic Poets* 48 n.42.

nature is such a commonplace in the classical age<sup>61</sup> that the notion may have had the status of a sympotic cliché already in the archaic period. A second song of Alcaeus reiterates the point, this time citing a divinity (as fr.13 does, where the gods grant the “endurance”) as the source of the remedial drink: “the son of Semele and Zeus gave men wine to make them forget their sorrows (*λαθικάδεα*)” (fr.346.3–4 V.). Archilochus’ very placement of the term *pharmakon*, postponed through enjambment, causes a listener retrospectively to register the innovation: by styling *τλημοσύνη* a drug, the poet glosses the abstraction with a term more regularly used for an entirely different object, wine.

It may also be worth noting a later variation on the conceit, which declares its fresh departure from its Odyssean and lyric models by altering the nature of the conventional *pharmakon* one further time: in fr.178.20 Pf., the Callimachean speaker urges Theogenes to “throw the *pharmakon* of conversation into the tedious wine.” Commentators point out the allusion to Helen’s drug, as well as the Alcaean echoes.<sup>62</sup> But Callimachus’ innovation also resembles the changes that Archilochus rang on the expected scenario; where fr.13 did not so much reject the stock identification of wine as a *pharmakon*, but mimetically effected it and so invited his audience to read between the lines, the Hellenistic poet makes the more typically remedial drink the source of the affliction that requires conversation as its cure.

A second, still later reader of the Parian poet also suggests the role of wine in the scenario that fr.13 describes. In the observation that prefaces his citation of two lines of fr.11, Plutarch remarks, “again, Archilochus is not praised for intending to fight with wine and amusements the grief he felt

<sup>61</sup> Cf. Ion of Chios fr.26.9 W., where wine is a “self-grown *pharmakon* of joy”; Eur. *Bacch.* 283–284, 421–423; Pl. *Leg.* 666B.

<sup>62</sup> G. Massimilla, *Callimaco. Aitia. Libri primo e secondo* (Pisa 1996) 412; M. Fantuzzi and R. Hunter, *Tradition and Innovation in Hellenistic Poetry* (Cambridge 2004) 82–83.

over the loss of his sister's husband at sea" (*Mor.* 33A–B).<sup>63</sup> It seems a fair assumption that the original portions of fr.11 would have introduced drink prior to the "amusements" advocated in the extant lines, and that it was wine's mention in the preceding lost verses that prompted Plutarch to identify the substance as the first of the two antidotes prescribed by Archilochus. An audience familiar with the poet's repertoire, and with the remedial and care-dispelling qualities of wine (visible already in Homer),<sup>64</sup> might naturally expect drinking to be present in fr.13, which begins with the same focus on *θαλία*, voices the same opposition—partying vs. sorrowing—and articulates the same sentiment (let's party) as fr.11.

Finally, and most importantly, there is the diction internal to fr.13, replete with terms as appropriate to the work's sympotic and "vinous" setting as to the nautical tragedy—which spurs the conceit—and the mourning it provokes. No sooner has the poet indicated the context in which his performance occurs in the opening lines than he recalls the "wave" that washed the victims down. Set this against the textual and visual sources cited above, which equate waves and the shipwrecks they cause with wine and the "drowning" its immoderate intake brings about, and the phrase acquires a double referent: is the singer describing a literal storm at sea, or warning, as Theognis would do in much the same terms,<sup>65</sup> against the danger that the present company will prolong its suffering through continuing to

<sup>63</sup> The expression *οὐκ ἐπαινεῖται* is also striking in the light of Archilochus' use of *μεμφόμενος* at the start of fr.13.

<sup>64</sup> See *Il.* 6.260–265; here wine has, paradoxically, the capacity to restore strength and to cause forgetfulness, not of grief, but of that martial might that brings grief to others.

<sup>65</sup> Cf. Theogn. 680 for the singer's fear "lest the wave drink down the ship" (*μή πως ναῦν κατὰ κύμα πίη*). Again, the noun has a two-fold referent: it evokes both the outsized wine-consumption that threatens the good order of the symposium, and, coextensive with that, the political danger that may overwhelm the "ship of state" should the symposiasts-turned-citizens engage in the same immoderate conduct.

drink to excess and thus experience an analogous “drowning”?

The vivid image that follows, where Archilochus imagines how he and his *hetairoi* Pericles have “lungs swollen with pains,” maintains this initial polysemy. As Burnett reads the expression, the poet transfers the water-logged condition of the victims’ corpses to the living bodies of the empathetic mourners, their organs inflated not with seawater<sup>66</sup> but with the emotional pains they suffer on the dead men’s behalf.<sup>67</sup> But there may be more to the choice of organs than mere *variatio* on traditional epic diction, which imagines the heart as the site swollen with disruptive emotions.<sup>68</sup> As multiple passages from Alcaeus through to classical (and later) dramatists, doctors, and philosophers attest, the lungs stand in intimate relation to the consumption of wine, repeatedly privileged for their role in receiving and processing the substance. Alcaeus’ fr.347 V. opens with a call on the poet’s part to his fellow symposiasts to “wet your lungs with wine,” and a fragment of Euripides describes “wine that has passed through the channels of the lungs” (fr.983 K.). Among later authors, Plato discusses how the lungs are capable of completely ingesting wine (*Ti.* 70C, 91A), while Plutarch, who cites the Platonic passages at *Mor.* 1047D, notes that the philosopher has the support of a host of other authors—Hippocrates, Eupolis, and Eratosthenes among them. Following upon the seawater/wine correspondence already introduced, the double entendre that fr.13 puts into play becomes evident: the matter that fills the victims’ bodies and mourners’ lungs to bursting point is not just the brine re-imagined in the

<sup>66</sup> Cf. *Od.* 5.455, where Odysseus’ whole body is swollen with seawater, forcing him to vomit it up when he arrives on shore.

<sup>67</sup> Note how *οἰδαλέους*, cognate with the term *οἶδμα* regularly used in epic and later sources for sea-swells, nicely prolongs the maritime note.

<sup>68</sup> In the more traditional reading of Burnett, which assumes Homeric precedence, Archilochus’ phrase points us back to *Il.* 9.554 and 646, where Achilles feels his heart similarly swollen, not with sorrow but with anger; the change that Archilochus sounds on his epic model demonstrates the poet’s “quiet ingenuity” (*Three Archaic Poets* 47–48).

form of psychic pain but the wine that more immediately bloats the symposiast's lungs, with all the corporeal suffering that results.<sup>69</sup> While this mode of drinking promotes the empathetic response and identification with the dead that Burnett signals, it would also block the remedial powers of the *pharmakon*, causing a prolongation of the grief that vitiates the proper spirit of the occasion. Archilochus, no more than the sympotic poets after him, is no advocate of consuming to excess, and, as the subsequent lines of the song detail, a different, and more moderate, course of conduct is what the poet (and the gods) has in mind.

Add to this the sympotic resonance of the type of *pharmakon*, "endurance," that Archilochus recommends, a term whose original and non-Homeric quality I noted above. A laudable property no doubt in the face of prolonged suffering (and the trait that, absent the abstract noun, the Homeric Odysseus displays in abundance),<sup>70</sup> but one that is also of particular relevance to the wine-fueled situation in which the singer and his addressee find themselves. A passage from the *Odyssey* illuminates the particular forum in which this Archilochean "endurance" or "resistance" might be looked for. In Book 18, assuming the role of lamp-tender who keeps the braziers burning through the late-night feast, the disguised hero challenges the company. In language that puns on his customary epithet, he declares that the suitors' capacity for night-long carousing cannot surpass his endurance in keeping the hall lamps ablaze: ἦν

<sup>69</sup> Nor does this exhaust the parallelism or wine/seawater confusion: in sympotic riddle competitions, losers might be forced to drink a cup of wine mixed with brine. The combination of the two substances may have been still more ubiquitous; a series of citations in Athenaeus suggest that sea water was regularly added to wine, whether to cure a variety of ailments or to preserve it during transportation: Athen. 31F–32A, 32D–E, 33B–C, with Davies, in *Athens Comes of Age* 73–74.

<sup>70</sup> See the hero's programmatic self-definition at *Od.* 5.222 and P. Pucci, *Odysseus Polytropos. Intertextual Readings in the Odyssey and Iliad* (Baltimore/London 1987) 45–49, for the many τλη- terms that cluster around him.

περ γάρ κ' ἐθέλωσιν ἐϋθρονον Ἥῳ μίμνειν, / οὐ τί με νικήουσι·  
πολυτλήμων δὲ μάλ' εἰμί (318–319). As Węcowski comments of  
the passage, “it looks then as if the endurance of the aristocrat  
who is capable of holding out to the end, *i.e.* till the dawn, was  
an important component of the convivial ethics of the day. And  
this is exactly what we know of the *symposion* where there were  
perhaps some special prizes for the one who survived wide-  
awake till dawn.”<sup>71</sup> In the footnote to this suggestion, Węcowski  
cites the ending of Plato’s *Symposium*: here, with the rest of the  
company now fast asleep (Agathon and Aristophanes are the  
last to succumb), Socrates stands up—recall the figure on the  
oinochoe—and departs the victor from what is staged from the  
outset as an agonistic event. No wonder that the philosopher  
outlasts the rest: among the singularities of this “atopic” indi-  
vidual to which Alcibiades draws attention are Socrates’ ca-  
pacity to “prevail over all” (πάντας ἐκράτει, 220A; cf. 214A)  
and the astonishing resistance that he shows in the face of the  
forces that debilitate other men, drink among them (220A). Is it  
this type of (symptotic) endurance that fr.13 urges the company  
to display?

The *Symposium* scene is revealing on a second count. As Plato  
describes it, even as Agathon and Aristophanes fall asleep they  
are passing the phiale between them, from left to right, the  
direction in which the cup conventionally circulates.<sup>72</sup> This  
quintessentially symptotic gesture matches up closely with the  
last four lines of fr.13. As the poet remarks in the curious con-  
cluding image, something—the object to which τὸδε refers is  
left studiously vague—is first “turned towards us,” provoking  
groans at the “blood-red wound,” and then again it is “passed  
on to others in turn.”<sup>73</sup> Commentators generally assume

<sup>71</sup> Węcowski, in *Omero* 629.

<sup>72</sup> Węcowski, in *Omero* 625–637, explores this at length and suggests that it  
is one of the defining elements of the symposium from the inception of the  
institution.

<sup>73</sup> In the middle voice, ἐπαμείβω refers to something that comes round in  
turn.

“suffering” or, in Campbell’s suggestion, *κακά*,<sup>74</sup> as the referent here, and Burnett reads the phrase as indicative of the poet’s “belligerent insistence on survival,” as the speaker derives strength from knowing that another will be afflicted after him.<sup>75</sup> But the neuter noun most immediately preceding *τόδε* is *pharmakon*, the remedial substance that, in the poem’s oscillating diction and in the notion familiar to the symposiasts, can also take the form of wine. Read as descriptive of the circuit of the wine cup passed from one drinker to the next (the performer, holding the object, might even gesture toward it as he sang the phrase), the lines present a fresh sympotic riddle: how can the medicinal potion prove both therapeutic and the cause of groan-eliciting wounds on the drinker’s part?

The solution, I suggest, depends again upon the audience’s familiarity with that common store of words, formulaic phrases, and themes that span generic boundaries and with a motif that appears, once more, in the banquet scene in Menelaus’ home. In the description that Homer gives of the drug placed in the wine bowl, it was one among the “crafty (*μητιόεντα*) *pharmaka*” (4.227) that Helen brought from Egypt, “where the fertile earth bears the most drugs, many good in mixture, and many wretched” (*πολλὰ μὲν ἐσθλὰ μεμιγμένα, πολλὰ δὲ λυγρὰ*, 229–230). Exploring the polarities and dualities implicit in a phrase expressive of what I would call the drugs’ inextricable “two in oneness,” Ann Bergren notes how Helen has no sooner ordered that the medicated wine be served than she prefaces her story by assigning that same union of opposites and “mingledness” attributed to her *pharmaka* to the dispensations of Zeus:<sup>76</sup>

<sup>74</sup> Campbell, *Greek Lyric Poetry* 147; amending the MS. reading *τόδε* to *τάδε* he clarifies the referent.

<sup>75</sup> Burnett, *Three Archaic Poets* 48.

<sup>76</sup> Bergren, in *Contemporary Literary Hermeneutics* 207. Helen then goes on not only to bid the company to “take pleasure (*τέρπεισθε*)” in the *muthoi* exchanged at the banquet, but introduces her story of Odysseus by describing the amazing feats that he performed, and what “the staunch man endured/dared (*ἔτλη καρτερὸς ἀνὴρ*)” (236–242)—a model symposiast.

“but the god Zeus gives both good and evil at one time to one man and at another to another (ἄλλοτε ἄλλω)” (236–237). It is hard not to hear the counterpart to Helen’s diction and its underlying theme<sup>77</sup> in Archilochus’ ἄλλοτε ἄλλος ἔχει τόδε as he, in effect, glosses the meaning of the concatenation of motifs that cluster in the Homeric scene: like the Egyptian drug ingested with the wine, the drink that the gods have given symposiasts works to both good and ill. Good, insofar as, in the Odyssean (and Hesiodic) model, it allows recollection without grief, forgetfulness of pain, and a moving on; bad not only because, drunk in excess, it can cause grievous bodily harm (and destroy that meld of moderation and abandonment that the symposium should achieve), but, perhaps, because its diversionary powers might risk a culpable obliteration of the memory of the dead. Archilochus’ song, by memorializing the victims in laudatory and implicitly epicizing terms (“such men”), blocks that amnesia.

The double vision that the poet has built into his song extends to the performer’s closing call to the company at large to bear up “with all speed” and “thrust off womanly grief.” Other sympotic songs include language parallel to the terms used here, albeit in much lighter vein. In the fragment of Alcaeus cited above (fr.347 V.), the poet calls on his fellow drinkers to “mix one part of water to two of wine, pour it in brimful, and let one cup jostle (ὠθήτω) another.” In a poem celebrating wine’s capacity to promote illusions in the sympotic context, Bacchylides evokes the “sweet compulsion of speeding cups” (σευομενᾶν κυλίκων, fr.20B.6–7 S.). As Slater comments, in each instance the cups appear to “chase each other round the room,”<sup>78</sup> as though engaged in a kind of maritime race. Athenaeus quotes the sympotic command to “rush it about” (περι-

<sup>77</sup> Indeed, Campbell, *Greek Lyric Poetry* 147, cites *Od.* 4.236–237 for the phrasing in line 7. For more on Helen’s statement, see my concluding discussion.

<sup>78</sup> Slater, *HSCP* 80 (1976) 167; cf. Antiphanes fr.234.3 K.-A., cited by Slater.



σοβελῖν, 504A–B), which, directed to the wine-pourer, urges him rapidly to fill the vessel as it circulates around the room.<sup>79</sup> In keeping with what lines 7–8 visualized, the passage of the wine cup from one drinker to the next, the singer’s parting directions urge a brief encounter with the object and, with the rapidly ingested draught by way of aid, the renunciation of grief as the symposiast hands the vessel on.

The parting injunction “bear up” mirrors the actions and equipment of the drinking party in one final respect; as inscriptions on the cups attest, one symposiast might pass a wine cup on to his neighbor with a greeting, pledge, or some form of imperative (albeit in the singular rather than the plural that Archilochus deploys here) that typically contains a challenge or provocation.<sup>80</sup> Archilochus’ τλήτε neatly revises the more conventional messages that the drinkers might sound out as they pronounced the words on the vessels. Very frequent on the pots and in the texts is the term χαῖρε, “rejoice/take pleasure,”<sup>81</sup> while the message on a mid-sixth-century black-figure oinochoe combines this with another common injunction, πίνε.<sup>82</sup> As Lissarrague notes of this jug, by placing the inscription between the two figures in the image, a flute player and a symposiast holding a large *krater*, the artist suggests that the musician addresses his companion, exhorting him to drink up.<sup>83</sup> Archilochus’ song freshly folds two into one: for all its paraenetic character and recommendation of steadfastness in the face of grief, to “bear up” is also to drink, and to experience the duality of the remedy—endurance and healing, or, to activate another meaning of the term, suffering (and even that

<sup>79</sup> See the discussion by Węcowski, in *Omero* 343.

<sup>80</sup> Węcowski, in *Omero* 345.

<sup>81</sup> E.g., a black-figure cup in Rome (Vatican Museum 456, *ABV* 235); see Lissarrague, *Aesthetics of the Greek Banquet* 61, for further examples. Note too Eur. fr.468 K., “as for all else be cheerful (χαῖρε) as the cup goes round.”

<sup>82</sup> Berlin, *Antikensammlung inv.* 31.131; *ABV* 176.2.

<sup>83</sup> Lissarrague, *The Aesthetics of the Greek Banquet* 60–61.

symposium-wrecking “boldness”)?—as, in common with your fellow symposiasts with whom your bonds are reaffirmed, you swallow down your dose.

What emerges from all this is a brilliantly variegated work, a duck-rabbit type of image that could be viewed in diverse ways depending on the spirit of the occasion (and the point that the evening had reached as it progressed from sobriety to increasing disarray) and whose diction and conceits unite several levels of meaning and frames of reference. And while there is no recapturing the manner in which a singer might perform the lines, it is tempting to imagine that through pacing, tone, and gesture, he would convey the sense of a recovered levity and conviviality as he moved from the somber opening to the more light-hearted, rapid-paced, and witty close.

But fr.13 does more than showcase the metasymptotic and self-reflexive language so typical of poetry composed for the drinking party and that poetry’s capacity for allusivity and ludic gestures, even in what remains for much of its trajectory a serious-minded and dark-hued song. In addition to this, Archilochus’ composition serves to remind us of one critical function that sympotic “table talk”<sup>84</sup> and the songs that kept in step with it could fulfill, consolation for bereavement and grief. Just as the Odyssean Helen in Book 4 includes diction typical of the language of *consolatio* in her reminder of the variability of a man’s experience (ἀτὰρ θεὸς ἄλλοτε ἄλλω / Ζεὺς ἀγαθὸν τε κακὸν τε διδοῖ· δύναται γὰρ ἅπαντα, 236–237),<sup>85</sup> so the fifth-

<sup>84</sup> The phrase is evoked by E. L. Bowie, “Greek Table Talk before Plato,” *Rhetorica* 9 (1993) 355–371.

<sup>85</sup> C. W. Macleod, *Homer. Iliad Book XXIV* (Cambridge 1982), in his note on *Il.* 24.525–556, where Achilles delivers a very similar statement of the dual nature of divine dispensation in his attempt to comfort the bereaved Priam, identifies this formulation as typical of *consolationes*, citing Helen’s lines along with other passages. Achilles makes his remark as he urges his guest to put his grief aside just before he and Priam share a meal (later vase images of the scene regularly show Achilles as a symposiast here, reclining on a couch).

century Archelaus composed an elegy for Cimon to comfort him for the death of his wife Isodice (Plut. *Cim.* 4.10), a work designed for performance at a symposium.<sup>86</sup> As these several instances suggest, the drinking party was a space where sorrows might be shared and, through the twin mechanisms of wine and song, be mimetically enacted, mitigated, and relieved.

By way of demonstrating the persistence of this consolatory function and, more narrowly, the longevity of the expressions and conceits that fr.13 already includes, we can close by looking forward to a Hellenistic epigram, this posing as a work for performance at the symposium and patently drawing on archaic precedents. Substituting for the pain of bereavement the pangs of unrequited love,<sup>87</sup> and in language that echoes Alcaeus fr.347 V., Asclepiades fashions his lines as an exhortation addressed to him by a fellow symposiast:<sup>88</sup>

πῖν', Ἀσκληπιάδη. τί τὰ δάκρυα ταῦτα; τί πάσχεις;  
 οὐ σέ μόνον χαλεπή Κύπρις ἐλήριστο,  
 οὐδ' ἐπὶ σοὶ μούνη κατεθήξατο τόξα καὶ ἰοὺς  
 πικρὸς Ἔρως. τί ζῶν ἐν σποδιῇ τίθεσαι;  
 πίνωμεν Βάκχου ζωρὸν πόμα· δάκτυλος ἄως.  
 ἦ πάλι κοιμιστὰν λύχνον ἰδεῖν μένομεν;  
 πίνωμεν δύσερως· μετὰ τοι χρόνον οὐκέτι πουλύν,  
 σχέτλιε, τὴν μακρὰν νύκτ' ἀναπαυσόμεθα.

Drink, Asclepiades; why these tears? What are you suffering? Not you alone has harsh Cypris taken captive, nor at you alone did bitter Eros sharpen his bows and arrows. Why, still living, are you placed in ash? Let's drink the draught of Bacchus neat. The dawn is but a finger's breath away. Or shall we wait to see

<sup>86</sup> I owe this reference to Bowie, *Rhetorica* 9 (1993) 362.

<sup>87</sup> This is, of course, a source of complaint in any number of archaic sympotic poems.

<sup>88</sup> *Anth.Gr.* 12.50 = 16 Gow-Page. Some commentators prefer to read the epigram as a self-address, but A. Sens, *Asclepiades of Samos. Epigrams and Fragments* (Oxford 2011) 102–103, makes a strong case for distinguishing speaker and poet.

again the lamp that summons us to bed? Let's drink, unhappy lover. It's no longer far away, wretched one, the time when we shall be at rest for one long night.

Again we are in a (putative) sympotic context where an individual grieves at an injury received, this in the form of the arrow wounds that erode—and not missiles on the battlefield—deals out, and performs the gesture typical of the mourner (bestrewing himself with dust); and again the poem rehearses a series of consolatory moves, complete with the Peisistratus-like reminder that tomorrow is another day. No less in keeping with the passages from archaic poetry earlier discussed is the implication that the subject's weeping is out of place: faced with the choice between convivial enjoyment and sorrowing, the sufferer should set grief aside and join the party so as to share in the all-too-fleeting pleasures that the symposium affords (so Archilochus' call for haste). Punctuating these therapeutic remarks are the several injunctions *πίν'* (1) and *πίνωμεν* (5, 7) that direct the grief-stricken individual to find an antidote in wine, a call, in this instance, for a draught in its full potency so as to overcome the wounds at which he weeps. And while so much in these lines points to the changed milieu and medium in which poetry is now composed and received, and Alcaeus, not Archilochus, is Asclepiades' chief model here, the power of the symposium and of the wine and poetry so integral to the institution to offer a remedy for pain remains a constant from the seventh century through to Hellenistic times.<sup>89</sup>

*November, 2011*

Dept. of Classics  
Columbia Univ.  
New York, NY 10027  
dts8@columbia.edu

<sup>89</sup> I am very grateful to Penelope Murray who most kindly read and improved an earlier version of this piece, to Egbert Bakker for sharing his forthcoming publication with me, and to the anonymous reader of this journal for very helpful comments.