

# *Epikouros* and *epikouroi* in Early Greek Literature and History

Brian M. Lavelle

ON APPEARANCES, one might simply assume that the Greek word ἐπίκουρος (“ally,” or perhaps more precisely, “fighter alongside”) was an early elaboration of κούρος (*i.e.*, κόρος, “male youth”).<sup>1</sup> Both words describe younger males, *ko-wo* (*korwos*) and *e-pi-ko-wo* are to be read upon Linear B tablets, and the hostile sense of ἐπί might be taken readily to explain how the prefix transforms its root into a military term.<sup>2</sup> Moreover, κούρητες (Dor. κωρήτες, “young warriors”), whose ritual connotations suggest that it was also of great age and which Homer uses to describe some warriors in the *Iliad*, might be reckoned a link between the two.<sup>3</sup> In fact,

<sup>1</sup> On κόρος/κούρος see A. Vaniček, *Griechisch-Lateinisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch* II (Leipzig 1877) 1082f; E. Boisacq, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*<sup>4</sup> (Heidelberg 1950) 497; P. Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque: Histoire des mots*, I (Paris 1968) 567; H. Frisk, *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* I (Heidelberg 1960) 920f *s.v.* κόρη; on ἐπίκουρος see Vaniček 1083; Boisacq 266; Chantraine 359; Frisk 537f; cf. M. Negri, “Ἐπίκουρος,” *RendIstLomb* 111 (1977) 228–36; and n.8 *infra*; cf. also nn.2–3 *infra*.

<sup>2</sup> On Linear B instances of *koros* (*kouros*) and *epikouros* see J. Chadwick and L. Baumbach, “The Mycenaean Greek Vocabulary,” *Glotta* 41 (1963) 192, 211; cf. H. Mühlestein, *Die oka-Tafeln von Pylos. Ein mykenischer Schiffskatalog?* (Basel 1956) 35 n.3; L. Deroy, “Une nouvelle interprétation des tablettes ‘oka’ de Pylos,” in A. Bartoněk, ed., *Studia Mycenaea. Proceedings of the Mycenaean Symposium, Brno, April 1966* (Brno 1968) 96; on the hostile sense of ἐπί, *e.g.* *Il.* 5.590; cf. LSJ *s.v.* ἐπί C.4; H. W. Smyth, *Greek Grammar* (Cambridge [Mass.] 1920) 379 (1689.3.d); on *o-pi/e-pi* cf. Mühlestein; A. Uchitel, “On the ‘Military’ Character of the *o-ka* Tablets,” *Kadmos* 23 (1984) 137 with n.11; cf. also n.10 *infra*.

<sup>3</sup> κούρητες in Homer: *Il.* 19.193, 248 (here synonymous with *kouroi*?); cf. H. Ebeling, *Lexicon Homericum* I (Leipzig 1885) 875f; M. W. Edwards, *The Iliad: A Commentary*, V: *Books 17-20* (Cambridge 1991) 257: “the word is no doubt much older than Homer ... it is not just a lengthened version of the formula κούροι Ἀχαιῶν (7 x *Il.*, 2 x *Od.*), but retains the specific sense of ‘young men’”; and B. HAINSWORTH, *The Iliad: A Commentary* III: *Books 9–*

however, connections between κούρος and ἐπίκουρος break down from here, with a resulting confusion in interpreting significant passages in Greek literature. By way of clarifying the problem, we shall discuss examples of specific usage of *epikouros* in Homer, Archilochus, and Herodotus, ending with some general conclusions and speculations.

## I

The earliest usages of *epikouros* in Greek literature are found in the *Iliad*, where the word's connotation is quite distinct from either that of *kouros* or *kouretes*.<sup>4</sup> *Epikouros* in Homer has really nothing to do with age-designation nor does it possess

---

12 (Cambridge 1993: hereafter 'Hainsworth') 132f: "As a common noun with proparoxytone accent, κούρετες, the word means simply 'young warriors'"). The Κουρήτες are mentioned as a tribe of earlier generation Achaean warriors by Phoenix (*Il.* 9.529ff): these once inhabited the land around Pleuron but were ejected by the Aetolians: Strab. 10.3.6; see also R. Merkelbach and M. West, *Fragmenta Hesiodica* (Oxford 1967) 60; Hainsworth 132; H. VAN WEES, *Status Warriors* (Amsterdam 1992: 'van Wees') 192f. Cretan *kouretes* were especially associated with Zeus as armed attendants: cf. Hes. fr. 123 (=Strab. 10.3.19; Merkelbach and West 60); Eur. *Bacch.* 120, fr. 472.14; on the "Hymn of the *Kouretes*," in which Zeus is addressed as "greatest *kouros*" repeatedly: see J. U. Powell, *Collectanea Alexandrina* (Oxford 1925) 160f; E. Diehl, *Anthologia Lyrica Graeca* II (Leipzig 1925) 279ff; Callim. *Jov.* 52ff; cf. G. R. McLennan, *Callimachus, Hymn to Zeus* (Rome 1977) 86; Strab. 10.3.7f, 11; Apollod. *Bibl.* 1.5; cf. Vaniček (*supra* n.1) 1082; Chantraine (*supra* n.1) 567; on Cretan *kouretes* see W. Burkert, *Greek Religion*, tr. J. Raffan (Cambridge [Mass.] 1985) 102, 127, 261f, although we may dissent from his inference (261f) that the *kouretes* of Crete are by their name "just the young warriors"; cf. n.15 *infra*. Anatolian *kouretes* were attendants or helpers of Artemis and Apollo on Mt Solmissos near Ephesus, a special place of assembly for them (Strab. 14.1.20; *SIG* 353.1; cf. Burkert 173). These connections are of interest as the Anatolian *kouretes* protected the newborn offspring of Leto from the evil intent of another god (*scil.* Hera) in the same way that the Cretan ones protected Zeus from Kronos (Strab. 10.3.11); cf. n.15 *infra*. On *kouroi* and *kouretes* see H. Jeanmaire, *Couroi et courètes* (Lille 1939); cf. also D. Fourgous, "L'invention des armes en Grèce ancienne," *AnnPisa* 3, 6.4 (1976: 'Fourgous') 1129ff.

<sup>4</sup> *Epikouros*: *Il.* 2.130, 803, 815; 3.188, 451, 456; 4.379; 5.473, 477f, 491; 6.111, 227; 7.348, 368, 477; 8.497; 9.233; 10.420; 11.220, 564; 12.61, 101, 108; 13.755; 16.538; 17.14, 212, 220, 335, 362; 18.229; 21.431; cf. 5.614. The word does not appear in the *Odyssey*. Cf. Ebeling (*supra* n.3) 456; see also n.5 *infra*; on *kouros* in Homer see Ebeling 878f; see also n.12 *infra*.

any of the tribal or ritual connotations associated with *kouretes*.<sup>5</sup> Rather, in the *Iliad*, *epikouroi* are, for the most part, mature males: seasoned warriors who fight for others as their allies; they are thus neither “youths,” “youthful fighters,” nor “armed youths who act as servant-protectors for Zeus or other gods.” “Fighter for pay,” *epikouros*’ other Classical Greek connotation, is not altogether out of line with Homer’s usage, but is an even farther cry from the basic meaning of *kouros*. Consequently, we assume that no later than Homer—and perhaps much earlier—*epikouros* had already developed its distinctive, more restricted military sense of a “fighting ally.”<sup>6</sup> The meanings of *kouros* and *epikouros* thus seem to diverge substantially early on.

In fact, some attempts to etymologize *epikouros* have altogether abandoned linking it to *kouros* (= \*κορϝ-ο-ς) and its commonly assumed Indo-European root \**ker* (e.g. Latin *crescere*).<sup>7</sup> Solmsen, for example, suggested that the root of ἐπίκουρος was really \**kers-o* (= \*κορσ-ο-ς; e.g. Latin *currere*) and that *epikouros*’ original meaning was therefore *Zuläufer*.<sup>8</sup> Ventris, Chadwick, and Baumbach, on the other hand, linked Mycenaean *e-pi-ko-wo* to Greek κοεῖν, making those famously dispatched from Pylos to the coast near the end of the Bronze Age

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Hesch. s.v. ἐπίκουρος; H. ERBSE, *Scholia Graeca in Homerum* (Berlin 1969: hereafter ‘Erbsen’) 208; Edwards (*supra* n.3); cf. n.15 *infra*, however, on Sarpedon and Zeus.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Chantraine (*supra* n.1) 359; Deroy (*above* n.2); and M. BETTALLI, *I mercenari nel mondo greco* (Pisa 1995: hereafter ‘Bettalli’) 39f. Deroy proposed that the *e-pi-ko-wo* of the Pylian *o-ka* Tablets (An 657, etc.; cf. M. Ventris and J. Chadwick, *Documents in Mycenaean Greek* [Cambridge 1956] 184ff; T. Palaima, *The Scribes of Pylos* [Rome 1988] 47f) were military allies or auxiliaries (cf. Negri [n.10 *infra*], who more thoroughly studied the word; cf. also Mühlestein [*supra* n.2]). Although that proposal rests upon little more than anachronism of *epikouros*’ meaning from the *Iliad*, it would seem superior to the less philologically grounded suggestions of Ventris, Chadwick, and Baumbach (n.9 *infra*) and the surmise of Uchitel (n.10 *infra*). Cf. also n.65 *infra*.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Frisk (*supra* n.1) 538; Chantraine (*supra* n.1) 359. See also n.8 *infra*.

<sup>8</sup> F. Solmsen, “Etymologien. 1. Gr. ἐπίκουρος,” *ZfVergleichSprachforsch* 30 (1890) 600f; cf. P. Kretschmer, “Literaturbericht für das Jahr 1911,” *Glotta* 5 (1913) 264; E. Kretschmer, “Beiträge zur Wortgeographie der altgriechischen Dialekte,” *Glotta* 5 (1913) 99; Boisacq (*supra* n.1) 266; cf. Chantraine (*supra* n.1) 359. On \**qurso* see further H. Hübschmann, “Echtarmenische Wörter,” *Armenische Grammatik I: Armenische Etymologie* (Leipzig 1897) 458; F. Froehde, “Zur lateinischen Lautlehre,” *BeitrKundeIndogermSprach* 14 (1901) 105.

"watchers" rather than "reinforcements."<sup>9</sup> Mühlestein, Deroy, and Negri, however, rejected such etymologies, proposing instead that Mycenaean *e-pi-ko-wo* connoted essentially the same thing as Homeric *epikouros*—in Deroy's words, "l'homme de renfort, l'auxiliaire qui accroît l'effectif."<sup>10</sup> Whatever validity we attach to such etymologies, most scholars seem to agree that *kouros* and *epikouros* possessed rather distinct meanings even in Mycenaean Greek.

To proceed further, we must return to Homer, whose usage of *epikouros* could be rooted in the Bronze Age. Homer employs *epikouros* in the *Iliad* invariably to mean "ally" (i.e., "fighter alongside"). He does not use the word for "youth" or "youthful fighter" nor, in fact, does he ever use it to mean "mercenary" or "fighter for pay." This consistency supports the notion that something like "fighter alongside" was in fact the basic sense of the word. There are further reasons to believe that it was.<sup>11</sup>

Forms of *epikouros* are used most often in the *Iliad* for the non-Greek fighting allies of the Trojans, in particular, the Lycians of southwestern Anatolia, their most important supporters.<sup>12</sup> The Lycians, who have come from afar to fight the

<sup>9</sup> Ventris and Chadwick (*supra* n.6) 188f *ad An* 657: "(*e-pi-ko-wo*) will mean 'watchers, lookouts'. Not=ἐπίκουροι 'allies'"; 392: "ἐπίκουρος 'ally' is probably excluded, \**epikorsos*, not \**epikorwos*." Cf. Chadwick and Baumbach (*supra* n.2); L. R. Palmer, *Mycenaean Greek Documents* (Oxford 1963) 149ff. Cf., however, n.65 *infra*.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. Mühlestein (*supra* n.2): "Hilfstruppen (von auswärts)" (cf. *Il.* 5.478); Deroy (*supra* n.2); and Negri (*supra* n.1) 236: "il combattente insieme." *Contra* Negri (235), *kouros* is not synonymous with "warriors": see *supra* text. For Uchitel (*supra* n.2: 137), "*o-pi-ko-wo* means 'those in charge of boys,' hence 'foremen.' *E-pi-ko-wo* may easily be the phonetic variant of the word." But this assumption, ostensibly driven by the author's attempt to disprove the military nature of the *o-ka* Tablets, ignores the prevalent military connotations of *epi-kouros* in other Greek literature (*viz.* *Iliad*; cf. nn.11–12 *infra*). On the Pylian *o-ka* Tablets see Mühlestein 1–51; Uchitel 136–63; and M. Lang, "The Oka Tablets Again," *Kadmos* 29 (1990) 113–25. Cf. *supra* nn.2, 4, 6, 9, and n.65 *infra*.

<sup>11</sup> Although the possibility that *epikouros* connoted "mercenary" even in Homer's day cannot be ruled out altogether, it can be said to be most unlikely. Homer applies *epikouros* to the most honorable and noble contingents at Troy who explicitly advocate fighting for glory and honor and abjure material gain: see text and nn.12, 14–18 *infra*.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. *supra* n.4. Lycians explicitly termed *epikouroi*: 5.477, 478, 491; 12.101; 16.538; their identification as *epikouroi* is distinctly implied at 2.803, 815; 5.473; 6.111, 227; 12.61; 17.212 and 220, where they or their leaders have been or will

Greeks, are conspicuous throughout the *Iliad* as warriors, but are most outstanding for their nobility: abandoning their homes and families, they have come to wage war explicitly for honor and glory.<sup>13</sup> Their leader, the great hero Sarpedon, stands out for his *arete* not only among the Trojans and their allies, but also among the Achaeans.<sup>14</sup> In the *Iliad*, the Lycian chief is actually—and rather remarkably for a Greek epic poem—the veritable paragon of Homeric heroism. Though sired by Zeus, Sarpedon is notable for his human excellence: valiant unto death, he is in fact the soldier's soldier of the epic.<sup>15</sup>

---

be more immediately mentioned. It may be implied at 2.130; 3.451, 456; 7.348, 368, 477; 8.497; 9.233; 10.420; 11.220, 564; 12.108; 13.755; 17.14, 362; and 18.229, especially as at 5.473ff and 6.78 the Lycians are emphatically linked to the Trojans as *epikouroi* and are their obviously most significant allies: cf. G. S. Kirk, *The Iliad: A Commentary I: Books 1–4* (Cambridge 1985: hereafter 'Kirk I') 262; A. B. Wace, *A Companion to Homer* (London 1962) 306: "the frequent phrase Τρῶες καὶ Λύκιοι suggests that they [*scil.* the Lycians] are, in fact, next to the Trojans themselves in importance." No other allies, Greek or Trojan, are as explicitly and frequently termed *epikouroi* as they. Homer uses *epikouros* once to describe a young Priam on campaign (3.188; cf. Kirk 291f); once for Aphrodite when she assists Ares (21.431, a comical application? cf. N. Richardson, *The Iliad: A Commentary VI: Books 21–24* [Cambridge 1985] 90); and once of the fighters entreated of the Mycenaeans by Tydeus and Polyneices for use against Eteocles and the Thebans (4.379; cf. Kirk I 369).

<sup>13</sup> On the Lycians in Homer see e.g. L. Malten, "Homer und die lykischen Fürsten," *Hermes* 79 (1944) 1–12; P. Frei, "Die Lykier bei Homer," in *ProIntCongClArch X* (Ankara 1978) 819–27; and T. R. Bryce, *The Lycians I: The Lycians in Literary and Epigraphic Sources* (Copenhagen 1986) 12ff; see also nn.15, 18 *infra*.

<sup>14</sup> On the Trojan side, Sarpedon is ostensibly second only to Hector in *arete*: cf. *Il.* 5.480f; M. M. Willcock, *A Commentary on Homer's Iliad, I–VI* (London 1970) 173; Kirk I 262; and Hainsworth 349. In fact, he is second to none in the purity of his motivation: see text *infra* and nn.15–18.

<sup>15</sup> Sarpedon is a 'special' hero to be sure: the connections between Sarpedon's excellence as a warrior (*supra* n.14; nn.16–17 *infra*), his relationship to Zeus (5.631, 6.199; cf. G. S. Kirk, *The Iliad: A Commentary II: Books 5–8* [Cambridge 1990: hereafter 'Kirk II'] 122), the *kouretes* as special armed servants of Zeus (*supra* n.3), and *epikouroi* as a description attaching especially to the Lycians in the *Iliad* (*supra* n.12), cannot all be fortuitous and so should not go unrecognized. The nature of those connections, however, is quite unclear and they are perhaps inconsequential for the *Iliad*, as Homer does not explicitly make them. Indeed, although *kouretes* and *epikouroi* imply warriors and warfare and both appear in the *Iliad*, Sarpedon is not once explicitly included among the *kouretes*. Homer's Sarpedon is much more human than he is divine or even superhuman: cf. *Il.* 5.480; and n.17 *infra*. On Sarpedon cf. G. Nagy, "The Death of Sarpedon and the Question of Homeric Uniqueness," in *Greek Mythology and Poetics* (Ithaca 1990) 122ff; Kirk II 125 (on Sarpedon's

Homer characterizes the Lycians in their leaders' statements and actions. Sarpedon declares outright that he left great wealth behind him—certainly every material thing he could ever need—on the banks of “whirling Xanthos” far to the south when he came to Troy to fight on behalf of the Trojans.<sup>16</sup> His honor and Homer's appreciation of it are most distinctly measured in Sarpedon's celebrated address to Glaucus (12.310–28), which amounts essentially to a précis of the heroic ethos. In that brief statement, Sarpedon establishes why warriors with any claim to honor must fight in the forefront. Because of what he says here, which is underscored by what he does throughout the epic, Sarpedon comes to epitomize the ideal warrior. In fact he is unrivalled for nobility and martial character.<sup>17</sup>

Homer's portrayal of Sarpedon's second-in-command intensifies the impression of Lycian heroism. Glaucus' encounter with Diomedes on the battlefield (6.119–236), wherein, during the mêlée, he and Diomedes evince remarkable chivalry, adds to the favorable impression of Lycian *epikouroi*. Glaucus' nobility is similar to Sarpedon's. At 6.207ff, Glaucus states that his father commanded him repeatedly to excel other warriors and thus to bring honor to his family. For Glaucus, as for Sarpedon, material gain from warfare counts for nothing: he cheerfully exchanges his costly armor for Diomedes', although he loses much by the gesture.<sup>18</sup>

---

name); on the antiquity of the Sarpedon myth—and Homer's difficulty with it—see P. Walthelet, *Les Troyens de l'Iliade* (Paris 1985) 82; see also nn.42–44, 50 *infra* for some further complications affecting Homer's treatment of the Lycians; cf. Hainsworth 350; Walthelet 80–84. Glaucus, whose name is not Lycian (so Hainsworth 350) is also 'special': see H. C. Avery, “Glaucus, A God? Iliad Z 128–43,” *Hermes* 122 (1994) 498–503; see also *supra* nn.13–14 and text *infra* with nn.17–18.

<sup>16</sup> *Il.* 5.478–81; Kirk II 110; cf. 12.310–14; and B. Fenik, *Typical Battle Scenes in the Iliad* (= *Hermes Einzelschriften* 21 [Wiesbaden 1968]) 51, who notes of the Lycian leader: “Sarpedon, however, continues to fight even though Troy's fall would mean no personal loss to himself.”

<sup>17</sup> Cf. Hainsworth 352: “These famous verses constitute the clearest statement in the *Iliad* of the imperatives that govern the heroic life and their justification. It is, as Sarpedon puts it, a kind of social contract: valour in exchange for honour....” Cf. van Wees (*supra* n.3) 72. It is true that Sarpedon links possessions and status to fighting, but he also says that undying reputation can only be achieved fighting in the forefront: cf. n.18 *infra*.

<sup>18</sup> Of the words spoken to Glaucus by his father, Kirk (II: 187) observes that “the same typically heroic advice” was given to Achilles by Peleus (11.783ff; cf. Hainsworth 306f). Cf. Avery (*supra* n.15) 498–503. On the en-

The Lycians are thus the noblest of all contingents at Troy, barbarian or Greek, for even the Greeks are depicted as coming to Troy for plunder (*cf.* 3.286; Kirk [*supra* n.12] 306). Because Homer treats the Lycians so favorably, and so frequently describes them as *epikouroi*, we must assume that he attached distinctly positive values to the epithet.<sup>19</sup> By the same token, the connotation "mercenary" for *epikouros* seems to be ruled out here, as Homer's characterization of the Lycians is incompatible with any notion that they would fight for anything so sordid as pay: in fact, the Lycians at Troy expressly distance themselves from material gain. We should conclude that *epikouros* did not conote "mercenary" for Homer's audience, for such a connotation would not only conflict with the poet's otherwise uniform portrayal of the Lycians as above gain, but would subvert Homer's depiction of them as nobly motivated by contradicting and making nonsense of it. Indeed, "fighters for pay" are absent in the *Iliad* and that absence, together with other information to be introduced below, may be taken to indicate that Greek mercenaries did not exist in Homer's time (*cf.* Bettalli 39f).

## II

The term *epikouros* appears in Archilochus fr. 15 and 216 West. It should be emphasized at the outset that Archilochus' use of *epikouros* does not automatically indicate that he was

---

counter of Glaucus and Diomedes see Kirk 171ff. This is not the place to address the dichotomy of the real and imaginary in the Homeric poems (van Wees 6ff). No one would argue that the Lycians are not idealized in the *Iliad*: *cf. supra* nn.14–17 and 45 *infra*. On the other hand, no one would deny that "by far the most prominent male excellence [*scil.* in the *Iliad*] ... is military prowess" (van Wees 72) or that the words and actions of the Lycians establish them as preminent among the warriors of the *Iliad*. Sarpedon's motivation to plunge into battle, expressed in his famous exchange with Glaucus, may be linked with a concern for wealth and status, but it may not be linked with his actual presence at Troy (*cf. Il.* 5.481): van Wees (105) points out the insecurity of absentee landlords. Honor could be got and kept much nearer to home and the Lycians had nothing to gain materially at Troy: *cf. supra* n.16. Some plausible motivation must account for the imagined presence of the Lycians so far from home, where their material interests are greatest, and, by the same token, for their superlative ranking as warriors in the *Iliad*. I take it to be actual fondness for war leading to practice, proficiency, and willingness to travel to fight: see text *infra* and *cf.* n.65 *infra*.

<sup>19</sup> *Cf.* Nagy (*supra* n.15) and *supra* nn.14–18.

himself a "mercenary" or that there were other Greek mercenaries in his time, as so many have assumed a priori.<sup>20</sup> Indeed, in view of Homeric *epikouros*' limited connotations and the fact that the word can mean "ally" in either fragment, such conclusions are unjustified until possibilities are tested. Evaluation of Archilochus' use of *epikouros* must be implicated with Homer's, as Archilochus' poetry was obviously markedly influenced by Homeric tradition. In fact, the combination of *epikouros* and "Glaucus" seems to make the implication more certain.

At fr. 15 (*ap. Arist. Eth. Eud.* 1236a33), the poet instructs his friend in aphoristic fashion: Φλαῦκ', ἐπίκουρος ἀνὴρ τόσσον φίλος ἔσκει μάχηται ("Glaucus, an *epikouros* man is a friend as long as he fights").<sup>21</sup> *Epikouros* could be translated here as either "ally" or "mercenary"; neither is entirely excluded as a possibility. If by *epikouros* Archilochus meant "fighter alongside," then he could have been emphasizing a modern, albeit more subtle, distance from what Homer's use of the word implies. For Archilochus, no *epikouros*, whatever the honorable implications of that title, is a *philos* without acting the part, *i.e.*,

<sup>20</sup> Cf. D. CAMPBELL, *Greek Lyric Poetry* (London 1967: hereafter 'Campbell') 136: "There is little evidence for the commonly held view that he [Archilochus] became a mercenary soldier"; D. GERBER, *Euterpe* (Amsterdam 1970: 'Gerber') 24: "It is often stated on the basis of [*scil. fr.* 216] and on allusions supposedly found in other passages that Archilochus at some time in his life became a mercenary. There is no concrete evidence to support this view." Among those who have uncritically accepted that Archilochus was a mercenary are *e.g.*: H. W. Parke, *Greek Mercenary Soldiers* (Oxford 1933) 4; F. Lasserre and A. Bonnard, *Archiloque. Fragments* (Paris 1958) 3, 9; M. Treu, *Archilochos* (Munich 1959) 195; A. R. Burn, *The Lyric Age of Greece* (London 1960) 167; G. Davenport, *Carmina Archilochi* (Berkeley 1964) 33; A. J. Podlecki, "Three Greek Soldier Poets: Archilochos, Alcaeus, and Solon," *CW* 63 (1969) 75; H. D. RANKIN, *Archilochus of Paros* (Park Ridge [NJ] 1977: 'Rankin') 43; V. N. Jarcho, "Noch einmal zur sozialen Position des Archilochos," *Klio* 64 (1982) 316; A. P. BURNETT, *Three Archaic Poets* (Cambridge [Mass.] 1983: 'Burnett') 41 n.22; and A. M. Miller, *Greek Lyric: An Anthology in Translation* (Indianapolis 1996) 1; Cf. Bettalli 106f; see also nn. 26, 28–29 *infra*.

<sup>21</sup> Cf. F. Lasserre, *Les Épodes d'Archiloque* (Paris 1955) 105f; Lasserre and Bonnard (*supra* n.20); Treu (*supra* n.20); G. Tarditi, *Archilochus. Fragmenta* (Rome 1968) 71; Burnett 44; *cf. e.g.* M. West, *Greek Lyric Poetry* (Oxford 1993) 14: "Glaucus, an auxiliary's a buddy for just so long as he's prepared to fight"; Bettalli 106 n.16: "Glaucos, un *epikouros* è amico sole finché combatte"; *cf. also* Burnett 44; Miller (*supra* n.20) 3. Well off the mark is the translation of Davenport (*supra* n.20) 33: "Keep a mercenary for a friend, Glaukos, to stand by in battle." On Glaucus, the friend of Archilochus, see J. Pouilloux, "Glaucos, fils de Leptine, Parien," *BCH* 79 (1955) 75–86.



without actually "fighting alongside." In this case, the poet uses an apparently gnomic conjunction of *epikouros* and *philos*—a conjunction found elsewhere in Greek literature<sup>22</sup>—but disrupts it by its qualifying dependence upon action. For Archilochus, an *epikouros* was in fact not immediately a *philos*, as Glaucus (or someone else) might uncritically infer from Homer's use of *epikouros*.<sup>23</sup>

Such a reading has much to recommend it. First, it would explain the redundancy of ἀνήρ, with which Archilochus qualifies *epikouros* to underscore it as an epithet. Second, Archilochus' tone is didactic, as if pointing out something not completely obvious. In fact the sentiments of the line parallel those found at fr. 114: 'appearances, you should know, Glaucus, are quite different from realities; in this case, words are different from deeds'.<sup>24</sup> *Epikouros* (= *philos*) is no more than fine sounding unless backed by action, especially when action is needed, viz., during a fight." Archilochus' message is thus based in Homer, yet becomes another comment on the difference between Homer's heroic world and Archilochus' far less ideal one. Perhaps some of Archilochus' contemporaries were claiming to be like Homer's famous *epikouroi*, and Archilochus deemed it necessary to correct impressions for his friend, a namesake of the famous Lycian in the *Iliad*. We shall see other grounds for this reading.

If, however, *epikouros* had already come to possess its more cynical, militarily more precise connotation of "mercenary" and Archilochus used the word in that way, then he could be observing a more substantial difference in the meaning of the

<sup>22</sup> Cf. Eur. *Andr.* 509: μόλε φίλοις ἐπίκουρος; *IA* 1241: ἄδελφε, μικρὸς μὲν σὺ γ' ἐπίκουρος φίλοις; 1452: ὃ φίλτατ', ἐπεκούρησας, ὅσον εἶχες φίλοις (though suspected: cf. W. Stockert, *Euripides. Iphigenie in Aulis*, II [Vienna 1992] 604); *Or.* 300: ἐπικουρία γὰρ αἶδε τοῖς φίλοις καλαί; 1300: ἔλθ' ἐπίκουρον ἐμοῖσι φίλοισι πάντως; *Rhes.* 937: ἐπέισαν ἔλθειν κάπικουρηῆσαι φίλοις. Less distinct conjunctions: *IA* 1018–27; *Or.* 306; *Rhes.* 955f.

<sup>23</sup> The gnomic conjunctions (*supra* n.22) seem to be rooted ultimately in Homeric *epikouros*, Homer's portrayal of *epikouroi*, and the word's implicit attachment to *philos* and *philoī* in the *Iliad* (cf. e.g. Eur. *Rhes.* 937, 955f): cf. also Eur. *Rhes.* 753, where Rhesus is described as an *epikouros* of the Trojans. See also text *infra*.

<sup>24</sup> Cf. Burnett (43f), who couples interpretation of fr. 15 with fr. 114 ("The Great General"). On fr. 114 see also Campbell 151f; Gerber 27f; Burnett 42f; P. Toohey, "Archilochos' General (fr. 114 W): Where Did He Come From?" *Eranos* 86 (1988) 1–14; and E. L. Wheeler, "The General as Hoplite," in V. Hanson, ed., *Hoplites* (London 1991) 132.

word in his own day. Once, in the bygone days of heroes, *epikouros* meant "fast ally who fought on behalf of friends"; the word implicitly connoted honorable motives and actions, as exemplified by Homer's Lycians. But these days, Glaucus, an *epikouros* is a *philos* only as long as the "mercenary" cares to make himself so, that is, as long as he cares to fight for his "friend." Archilochus' implication, which would seem then to pivot more upon *philia* than *epikouros*, would be that, although the words may have been synonymous in the past, *epikouros*' new connotation of "mercenary" means that neither in combination may be taken literally: a real ally who was a steadfast friend is now not more than a momentary "ally" and only a "friend" until the money runs out and he stops fighting or, more to the point, an *epikouros* (= "mercenary") is no *philos* at all. In such a case, Archilochus' meaning would be more topical and obvious to Glaucus, who, one presumes, was also a warrior; it would not have been apparent to a more general audience though (see text *infra*). The sentiment would be much less interactive with Homer, who never used *epikouros* to mean "mercenary": it is then more a mere, rather banal "news of the day" notice than parodic poetry or artfully adjusted gnome. Indeed, Archilochus would be simply playing off *epikouros*' (apparent) neology against Homer rather than playing with Homer as he does so frequently and so pointedly elsewhere (*cf.* Rankin 39ff, esp. 43).

Although neither of these two interpretations may be ruled out on present evidence, the latter has less to recommend it than the former, not least because it relies on Archilochus' wider audience to read the apparently less familiar connotation of "mercenary" into *epikouros* here. Though we have but one line, one imagines that a 'flag' of some sort would be present in the line, were Archilochus employing the word to mean "mercenary": it is a complete sentiment after all. If *epikouros* acquired the connotation of "mercenary," it did so between Homer's time and Archilochus', that is, fairly recently, and without some indication or prompting, Archilochus' audience would more reasonably have understood the standard epic meaning of *epikouros* than the relatively newer, more specialized one.<sup>25</sup>

<sup>25</sup> *Cf.* Rankin 36: "The general familiarity of epic poetry in his time and its pervasion of all art made it difficult for him [*scil.* Archilochus] not to allude to its characteristic phrases in contexts not exactly appropriate to their original image...."; 43: "Archilochos uses the phrases and themes which every decent man accepted as integral to poetry at that time...." For a somewhat different view *cf.* R. Fowler, *The Nature of Greek Lyric Poetry: Three Preliminary Studies* (Toronto 1997) 20ff.

Glaucus, on the other hand, would perhaps have known the new meaning all too well: what then was the point of Archilochus' didactic tone? Although Archilochus addresses a "Glaucus," whose Homeric namesake was a famous friend and *epikouros*, and he explicitly links "friendship" with *epikouros*, thus evoking the gnomic connection of the two, which may have originated in, or been strengthened by, the *Iliad*, he does not so much as hint at pay in the fragment.

On the other hand, a contrast between *philos* and *epikouros*, already well-grounded in Homer, was nonetheless a subtler and more interesting construction, more informative to Glaucus and the general audience, and more in line with sentiments actually expressed elsewhere in Archilochus' verse (fr. 114). Undoubtedly Archilochus, conscious of Homeric *epikouros* and its application to the Lycians, adopted the didactic rôle (i.e., of Sarpedon) for his (coincidentally?) homonymous friend Glaucus. These resonances suggest that the poet was signalling definite interaction to his audience, especially as he gave them no indication to the contrary. Interpretation of the fragment as interactive with Homer also accords with Aristotle's citation (*Eth. Eud.* 7.2.14, 1236a33), which he adduced to illustrate a type of friendship (*chresimon*): any connection of "mercenary" to the fragment would have vitiated Aristotle's point by making it nonsense. Aristotle's use of the fragment also suggests that nothing else in the poem linked it to mercenaries. Thus the evidence altogether points to the conclusion that Archilochus used *epikouros* in fr. 15 to mean "ally," not "mercenary," trading more directly and yet more subtly upon Homer's use of *epikouros*.<sup>26</sup> If so, fr. 15 probably antedates fr. 216 and quite possibly precedes Greeks employed as mercenaries.

Fr. 216 with *Kar* qualifying *epikouros* might seem more helpful but is actually more problematic. Obviously, this fragment, too, must be understood in light of Homer: καὶ δὴ ἑπίκουρος ὥστε Κάρ κελήσομαι ("And indeed [an] *epikouros* just like a Carian I shall be called).<sup>27</sup> Many have taken *epikouros* to mean

<sup>26</sup> The assumption that *epikouros* means "mercenary" in this fragment seems to have come about because (1) fr. 216 associates *Kar* and *epikouros* (see text *infra* with n.27), (2) *epikouros* came to connote "mercenary" (cf. B. M. Lavelle, "epikouroi in Thucydides," *AJP* 110 [1989] 36), and (3) the Greeks later thought the Carians to be the inventors of the mercenary profession. See *supra* n.20 and text with nn.27–29 *infra*.

<sup>27</sup> *Ap.* *ΣΠ.* *Lach.* 187B; Lasserre and Bonnard (*supra* n.20) 9; Treu (*supra* n.20) 195; Tarditi (*supra* n.20) 83; Podlecki (*supra* n.20) 75; Gerber 24; cf. Fourgous 1146; Jarcho (*supra* n.20) 316; Burnett 41 n.22; and Bettalli 106 n.17.

“mercenary” here, as the Greeks charged the Carians specifically with inventing the mercenary profession and explicitly linked the invention to Archilochus’ fragment.<sup>28</sup> “Fighter for pay,” a connotation of *epikouros*, surfaces as early as Herodotus, and Plutarch’s reference to the military services of Arselis of Mylasa in Caria rendered to Gyges has been taken to mean that professional soldiering was established in the Greek world by Archilochus’ time.<sup>29</sup> A modern negative appraisal of mercenary warfare, informed by subsequent examples and slights aimed at the Carians in Greek literature, have led some to construe the fragment as Archilochus’ exasperated, quite pessimistic assertion of

<sup>28</sup> Ephorus, *FGrHist* 70F12 (=ΣPl. *Lach.* 187B); Ael. *NA* 12.30; cf. Strabo 14.2.28; see also A. W. GOMME, *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides* I (Oxford 1945: hereafter ‘Gomme’) 106ff; M. M. AUSTIN, *Greece and Egypt in the Archaic Age* (Cambridge 1970: ‘Austin’) 17; Fourgous 1142ff; cf. O. BÜRCHER, “Karer,” *RE* 10.2 (1919) 1940; Tarditi (*supra* n.21) 83; and *supra* n.20. Notable dissenters are Campbell and Gerber (*supra* n.20). See also text *infra* with nn.46–47, 49.

<sup>29</sup> Plut. *Mor.* 302A; cf. G. Huxley, *The Early Ionians* (London 1966) 52; G. Bean, *Turkey beyond the Maeander* (London 1971) 31; and S. HORNBLOWER, *Mausolus* (Oxford 1982: hereafter ‘Hornblower’) 16 n.81, who mistakenly identifies Candaules as the recipient of Arselis’ aid. *Contra* Huxley, Bean, Hornblower, *et al.*, whose reasoning seems to be a priori (see *supra* n.26): the reference to Arselis as an *epikouros* of Gyges does not by any means automatically make him a mercenary: cf. e.g. Bettalli 75f: “L’aiuto concesso da Arselis, più che un piego di forze mercenarie, ricorda comunque, nelle modalità con le quali venne effettuato, gli interventi di ἐπίκουροι che abbiamo trovato nell’*Iliade*, facenti parte di quella catena di mutuo soccorso tra dinasti e aristocratici che si serviva di truppe composte dagli amici e dai *clientes* dei vari capi.” Cf. J. G. Pedley, “Carians in Sardis,” *JHS* 94 (1974) 96–99, who suggests that the Carians were powerful independent allies, not vassals of the Lydians. Cf. also F. C. Barrett, tr. *Plutarch, Moralia* (Loeb edition: Cambridge [Mass.] 1972) 233 and *supra* n.20. Later Mermnads, such as Alyattes, were apparently tied to Caria by marriage-alliance (cf. Hdt. 1.92.3), and Arselis can have come to aid Gyges for political reasons or others rather than because he and his warriors were to be paid for fighting for the Lydian.

his reality and even his identity.<sup>30</sup> Quite another interpretation is possible however.

It is true that ὥστε Κάρ seems unrelated to the prevalent Homeric connotations of *epikouros* and the heroic, exemplary Lycians. The Carians, mentioned only briefly in the *Iliad*, are nevertheless portrayed as the very opposites of the Lycians. Nastes, the Carian leader, is treated with special derision in the Trojan Catalogue; he is among the worst fighters at Troy, Achaean or barbarian.<sup>31</sup> "He came to war wearing gold, just like a girl, the fool" (2.872f).<sup>32</sup> Nastes' ridiculously overdressed image, equating him with a *kore*, suggests that he is no warrior at all but effeminate and cowardly, just like his overdressed Trojan counterpart Paris (cf. *Il.* 3.17f).<sup>33</sup> Without any other form or feature in the *Iliad*, Nastes becomes for all time a gold-bedecked maiden, the allusion to which was surely meant to conjure further images of tender brides and hymeneals for Homer's audience. Nastes is thus positioned at the other, very negative extreme from the likes of Achilles and Sarpedon, for he is no more than a gaudily apparelled sham of a warrior,

<sup>30</sup> Cf. Büchner (*supra* n.28) 1942; Burnett 44 n.22; Bettalli 106f. Negative reading of the assertion seems grounded first of all in the misunderstanding of a scholiast (ultimately Aristophanes of Byzantium?) on *Il.* 9.378: τῶ δέ μιν ἐν καρὸς αἴσῃ; cf. ΣΠ. *Euthyd.* 285c (E. H. Gifford, *The Euthydemus of Plato* [Oxford 1905] 33); Porph. p.137.5 Schrader: ἀπὸ τῶν Καρῶν, οὓς αἰεὶ λοιδορεῖ ὁ ποιητής, οἷον ἐν μοῖρα Καρὸς οἴονει δούλου κτλ. Καρὸς was apparently mistaken for καρὸς ("chip" or "shaving": cf. Hainsworth 112), but this was perhaps a natural mistake in view of (1) the problematic nature of καρὸς (cf. Hainsworth, Ebeling [*supra* n.3] 651; Frisk [*supra* n.1] 790f), and (2) a tradition of hostility toward the Carians, which probably derived mostly from Athenian sources of the later fifth century and after (cf. Hornblower 29ff; cf. also n.72 *infra*), all of which was coupled with fr. 216 in antiquity (cf. Pl. *Lach.* 187b). Cf. also Gerber (*supra* n.20) and Fourgous 1145f.

<sup>31</sup> Cf. Kirk I 250ff *ad* 2.87f; cf. also text and nn.33–34 *infra*.

<sup>32</sup> Although Aristarchus made Amphimachus, the other Carian leader, the antecedent of ὄς at line 873, Simonides understood it to be Nastes (see Erbe 351; cf. R. Lattimore, tr., *Homer, Iliad* [Chicago 1951] 99). Cf. Kirk I 261, whose note observing and correcting Simonides' "error" is nevertheless unclear; cf. also Avery (*supra* n.15) 500f n.15. Whether Nastes or Amphimachus is meant—and with Simonides I take it to be Nastes—the slander of the "despised barbarians," *i.e.*, the Carians (cf. W. Leaf, *The Iliad* [London 1900] 115), is undiminished: cf. Fourgous 1145; and nn.33, 34, 39 *infra*.

<sup>33</sup> *Contra* Kirk I 267, Homer's description of Paris cannot be dismissed by proposing that the poet may be "a little careless" here. Quite to the contrary, the poet is conjuring absolute disdain for Paris in his audience: cf. J. Griffin, *Homer on Life and Death* (Oxford 1980) 3f, on warriors and effeminate clothing in Homer. Cf. nn.36, 39 *infra*.

another hapless, golden grainstalk to be harvested by the spear of a real hero like Achilles.<sup>34</sup> As the Carians entire are mentioned only once elsewhere in the *Iliad* (10.428) and there not in combat, the characterization of Nastes in the Trojan Catalogue amounts, as it was surely intended, to a quite negative collective description. The Carians are the opposites of the Lycians because their leader is the reverse of Sarpedon. The Lycians are formidable and admirable because valorous and honorable; the Carians, weak and ridiculous because garish and unmanly. At least ostensibly, that is what Homer wants his audience to make of them.

This distinct polarity actually varies somewhat from the realities of Homer's own day. By then, Carians and Lycians had been neighbors in southwestern Anatolia for some time, presumably used the same armor, and fought in similar ways to survive against surrounding enemies.<sup>35</sup> In fact, as we shall see, the Carians were by reputation a far cry from Homer's unflattering allusion to them as poor warriors. Rather Homer has gone well out of his way both to treat the Carians disparagingly and to portray the Lycians flatteringly; he has obviously polarized them. Certainly, from the *Iliad*, no one would mistake one for the other, as the sentiments expressed or the actions taken by Sarpedon, Glaucus, and the Lycians are not for the Carians.

Homer further negatively distinguishes the Carians from all other barbarian contingents at Troy by labelling them explicitly and uniquely *barbarophonoi*.<sup>36</sup> According to Apollodorus *gram-*

<sup>34</sup> Griffin (*supra* n.33) 4 n.8: "Such warriors [Paris and Nastes] exist only to be slain by proper heroes [such as Achilles and Aias]." In fact, Nastes' death in Book 21 (amidst the Paeonians? see 10.428; 21.209f; cf. Kirk I 261), to which Homer alludes in the Trojan Catalogue (873f), is omitted from Achilles' *aristeia* perhaps showing that the encounter is beneath mention even there. See further Griffin 3ff (on effeminate clothing and collective, negative characterization); Hall (n.39 *infra*). In view of Homer's treatment of the Carians, it is difficult to agree with Fourgous 1146: "Le Carien représente un type de guerrier magique, qui s'appuie sur une magie métallurgique, celle de l'or."

<sup>35</sup> Herodotus' assumptions (1.171.1f) that the Carians were subjects of the Cretans (if they were not actually considered Cretans themselves: cf. 1.172.1; Hornblower 12), that the Lycians were Cretans (1.173.1f), and that Lycian customs were part Cretan, part Carian (1.173.3), must have made them "cousins," as it were, in Herodotus' thinking. Cf. W. W. HOW and J. WELLS, *A Commentary on Herodotus* (Oxford 1912: hereafter 'How and Wells') I 130-34; nn.42-44, 53 *infra*.

<sup>36</sup> *Il.* 2.867; Ebeling (*supra* n.3) 225. This unique and obviously significant adjective, the negative aspects of which are elaborated by Strabo (14.2.28: μή λεγομένων τε βαρβάρων, πῶς ἔμελλεν εὖ λεχθήσεσθαι τὸ βαρβαρῶνων; cf.

*maticus* (*ap.* Strab. 14.2.28), the term amounted to an emphatic derision of the Carians, which originated with the Ionian Greeks, who were at war with the Carians early on and so hated them. Other Greek traditions, suggesting that Carians and Ionians were special enemies—one assumes beginning no later than the Greek migration to Ionia at the end of the Bronze Age<sup>37</sup>—corroborate his comment. Certainly Homer's reference to Miletus as Carian indicates that the tradition he followed was probably fixed soon after that migration, when the Ionians were fighting for their lives presumably against the Carians in what became Carian Ionia.<sup>38</sup> Homer's treatment of the Carians could

---

Bürchner [*supra* n.28]), is inadequately treated by, *inter alios*, Leaf (*supra* n.32); Kirk I 260; and E. Hall, *Inventing the Barbarian: Greek Self-Definition through Tragedy* (Oxford 1989) 1ff, who argues that "the polarization of Hellene and barbarian was invented in specific historical circumstances during the early years of the fifth century B.C...." This not only denies the significance of the Homeric derogation *barbarophonoi*, the basic infrastructure of the *Iliad*, which is polemical and severely distinguishes non-Greeks from Greeks, especially in battle, but also, to my mind, Hall's own later work, the premise of which, the effeminization of the non-Greek, seems to call into question the thesis of her earlier one (*cf.* n.39 *infra*). Negative distinctions between Greek and barbarian are likeliest to have come into being no later than the early stages of the Ionian colonization and were probably exacerbated by war between Ionian Greeks and natives: *cf.* Fourgous 1143ff; see nn.37–39 *infra*. Attitudes generating such polarities will have softened in some places over time (*cf.* text with nn.41, 43 *infra*), but surely never entirely died out. They will undoubtedly have been reawakened more generally first by the attacks of the 'barbarian' Lydians (*cf.* Hdt. 1.6), and then by the invasion of the Persians, all well *before* the end of the sixth century.

<sup>37</sup> *Cf.* Pherec. *FGrHist* 3F155; Hdt. 1.146.2f; Polyb. 16.12; Paus. 7.2.5–10, 3.2, 5f, 4.2f, 9f; Vitruv. *De arch.* 4.1.4f; see also Huxley (*supra* n.29) 23ff.

<sup>38</sup> Homer says that Miletus was Carian at the time of the Trojan War (*Il.* 2.868), but that must have been only for a brief time after the collapse of Mycenaean power in the eastern Aegean and before the Ionians repossessed (or perhaps first appropriated?) the site. On Miletus as Carian *cf.* Pherec. *FGrHist* 3F155 (=Strab. 14.1.3; see also n. 41 *infra*); Hdt. 1.142.3f; Paus. 7.2.5f. On Late Bronze Age Miletus see G. Kleiner, "Stand der Erforschung von Alt-Milet," *Ist Mitt* 19–20 (1970–71) 113–23; *cf.* J. M. Cook and D. J. Blackman, "Archaeology in Western Asia Minor, 1965–70," *AR* 17 (1970–71) 44f; C. Mee, "Aegean Trade and Settlement in Anatolia in the Second Millennium B.C.," *AnatSt* 28 (1978–79) 133–37; S. Mitchell and A. W. McNicoll, "Archaeology in Western and Southern Asia Minor," *AR* 25 (1978–79) 63; K. Gödeken, "A Contribution to the Early History of Miletus: The Settlement in Mycenaean Times and its Connections Overseas," in E. B. French and K. A. Wardle, edd., *Problems in Greek Prehistory* (Bristol 1988) 307–18; *cf.* W. Aly, "Karier und Leleger," *Philologus* 68 (1909) 428–44. A. G. Dunham, *The History of Miletus* (London 1915) 44, points out that there is no tradition of wars with Carians

well reflect the hostilities of that period of intense warfare right around the migration, for derogations of this kind are common in such circumstances. Ridicule of an enemy in war-time, a part of enmification, is a concomitant of such hostility—diminishment of fear by the establishment of psychological dominance over the foe.<sup>39</sup> Homer's effeminate Carians are in fact reflected in Greek portrayals of the Persians in the wake of the Persian invasion of the early fifth century.<sup>40</sup>

---

after the apparently intense hostilities of the initial period of migrations. Leaf (*supra* n.32) notes the possible antiquity of *Il.* 2.868, but Kirk (I 262) denies it, asserting that "the reference to non-Greek-speaking Carians must be deliberately archaizing." The latter supplies no ground for accepting such archaizing, the purpose of which one must question in any case. Rather than "deliberately archaizing," Homer or, rather, his source(s) are likelier to have drawn upon "existing references to Asia Minor in Mycenaean sagas," which were out of sync with realities in his day: *cf.* R. Hope Simpson and J. F. Lazenby, *The Catalogue of Ships in Homer's Iliad* (Oxford 1970) 178–81: "In fact, the archaeological evidence suggests, if anything, that the reference to Miletus in the Trojan Catalogue reflects rather the brief period, after the Trojan War...." *Cf.* also Wace (*supra* n.12): "It is striking, however, that after Miletus had become one of the greatest cities of Greece she should still figure in the national epic on the enemy side. The only likely explanation is that the *Catalogue* is presenting historical fact." *Cf.* also text *infra*.

<sup>39</sup> *Cf.* J. Shay, *Achilles in Vietnam* (New York 1994) 103f (although he does not treat the Carians); M. May, *A Social Psychology of War and Peace* (New Haven 1943) 90: "Anything that belittles or minimizes the danger or calls attention to features of the situation which look encouraging tends to reduce the fear. Apparently what happens here is that the individual himself or someone else gives a word stimulus that arouses responses that compete with those that arouse the fear-anxiety drive." On enmification and, in particular, imagining the enemy as a 'bad human' see R. W. Rieber and R. Kelly, "Substance and Shadow: Images of the Enemy," in R. W. Rieber, ed., *The Psychology of War and Peace: The Image of the Enemy* (New York 1991) 3–40, esp. 12–21. On Athenian employment of negative gender-metaphors for enemies see E. Hall, "Asia Unmanned: Images of Victory in Classical Athens," in J. Rich and G. Shipley, ed., *War and Society in Ancient Greece* (London 1993) 108–33, esp. 110ff, who argues that the Athenians (specifically Aeschylus) created a gendering polarity that designated the Persians as effeminate. This is exactly the disparagement observable in Homer's treatment of the Carian Nastes. Even on this basis, the notion of "invention" of the barbarian in the fifth century merits reconsideration: see *supra* n.36.

<sup>40</sup> *Cf.* Hall (*supra* n.39) 110–14, 118–21, whose focus is the Aeschylean corpus, nevertheless makes that corpus reflect popular views of the 'barbarian'. We must remember that, in Aeschylus' day, the Persian 'barbarians' were by no means entirely tamed and fears of their further incursions into the Aegean were very real and grounds for great alarm certainly as late as the Samian revolt in 440: *cf.* Thuc. 1.115.2–17.2, esp. 116.3 (on which incident *cf.* Gomme



If such is the case, Homer must have inherited and so must preserve an ancient tradition—an early post-Bronze Age ‘snapshot’, as it were—for Carians and Ionians had apparently long ceased fighting in the region and coexisted more or less peacefully by his time. Homer’s disdain for the Carians and their fighting abilities might indicate persistent hatred, but other evidence suggests that intense hatred was temporary and regional rather than of long-standing or widespread. According to other Greek traditions, during the Ionian migration Greeks intermarried with Carians soon after arriving in Anatolia, notably at Erythrae, Teos, Caunus, and Miletus. They are very likely to have done so elsewhere in what became Carian Ionia.<sup>41</sup> We have no reason to doubt such traditions, especially because they make a good deal of sense: intermarriages in Ionia, as elsewhere, were undoubtedly wrought from expediency and will have ultimately pacified hostilities between natives and newcomers. Greeks and Carians became kin in Ionia, and indications are that the Greeks will have abandoned the intense hatred betokened in the *Iliad* many years before the epic was composed.

Strabo remarks that Greek historians and poets not infrequently confused Carians and Lycians; he may well include

---

349ff, esp. 353; S. Hornblower, *A Commentary on Thucydides I* [Oxford 1991] 187–93; Plut. *Per.* 26.2; Diod. 12.27.4; cf. G. Shipley, *A History of Samos, 800–188 B.C.* (Oxford 1987) 113–20; M. F. McGregor, *The Athenians and their Empire* (Vancouver 1987) 99f.

<sup>41</sup> Erythrae: Paus. 7.3.7; Teos: Paus. 7.3.5; Caunus: Hdt. 1.172.1; cf. Thuc. 1.116.3; Miletus: Hdt. 1.146.2f; Paus. 7.2.5. Cf. Beloch *Gr. Gesch.* (Strasbourg 1913) I.1 97ff; Austin 54 n.1 on relations between Carians and Ionians early on; cf. also Fourgous 1150. Hornblower (17) notices Greek-Carian intermarriages during the reign of Croesus, but this surely must have been a regular occurrence by then: cf. Pedley (*supra* n.29). Pherec. *FGrHist* 3F155 (=Strab. 14.1.3): “Of it [the Ionian *paralia*], Pherecydes says that in earlier times Carians held Miletos and Myos and the parts around Mycale and Ephesus.” Traditionally, however, Myos was ‘founded’ by Cydrelus, *nothos* of Codrus; Priene (on the Mycale promontory) by Aepytus, son of Neleus; Erythrae by Cnopus, *nothos* of Codrus; Ephesus by Androclus, son of Codrus; and Teos (during the Ionian migration) by Naucelus, son of Codrus (Strab. 14.1.3). All these are surely further remnants of ancient revisionism, dating, at least ostensibly, from the end of the Bronze Age. Cf. n.43 *infra*. Fourgous (1145) suggests that Homer’s hostility may have been influenced by a more contemporary tradition of Ionian hostility, but that flies in the face of the above evidence and the joint Carian-Ionian expedition to Egypt: text with n.52 *infra*.

Homer among them.<sup>42</sup> Conscious substitution of 'Lycian' for 'Carian' undoubtedly nurtured the 'confusion' in view of the die-hard tradition of hostility to the Carians upon which Homer drew and which he may have helped to strengthen. In one obvious case, "Lycian" kings were quite artificially ascribed as the rulers of Greek settlers of Caria. Such substitution was encouraged, if it was not created for later, unknowing authors by the authority of the *Iliad* and its starkly contrasting portrayals of Lycians and Carians. The one race was stellar; the other contemptible—at least in the Homeric tradition. Better for some authors to have ancestors or associates of the heroic age made over from Carians into 'Lycians'; others, however, did not disown their Carian ancestry.<sup>43</sup>

The Greeks considered the Lycians, whose land was at some distance from the coast, to be related to them through heroes such as Bellerophon and, evidently, not to have been involved in post-Bronze Age warfare against the Greeks. Indeed, pottery remains from the acropolis of Xanthos, around whose foot the "eddying Xanthos" flows, indicate no Bronze-Age habitation.<sup>44</sup> At least the Lycians' portrayal as "noble barbarians" in

<sup>42</sup> Confusion of poets: Strab. 14.3.5; of historians and poets: 12.8.7. Homer was himself 'confused', for two of the followers of Sarpedon have a Carian father, Amisodaros (*Il.* 16.328; see H. L. Lorimer, *Homer and the Monuments* [London 1950] 473). Cf. also M. van der Valk, *Eustathii Commentarii ad Iliadem Pertinentes* I (Leiden 1971) 579, an ancient notice of Homer's seemingly singular hostility to the Carians; and *supra* n.15 and nn. 43, 50 *infra*.

<sup>43</sup> On "Lycian" kings for Ionian settlers: Hdt. 1.147.1 (*cf.* How and Wells I 122, who nonetheless seem to accept it). A number of notable Ionians possessed Carian blood: Thales' father Examyces had a Carian name (D.L. 1.22; Hornblower 17); and although Herodotus is called a "Lycian" by Athenaeus (3.75F), his father's name, Lyxes, was Carian (*cf.* Hornblower 10 n.49) as, it seems, was that of his uncle, Panyassis (Hornblower, 24). Histiaeus, son of Tymnes and instigator of the Ionian revolt of the early fifth century, was undoubtedly of Carian blood: *cf.* Hdt. 5.37.1, 7.98 with How and Wells II 15; Hornblower 24 n.144. According to Pausanias (7.3.7), Carians were mixed with Lycians at Erythrae, which conflicts with Strabo's account: the information surely derives either from Pausanias' altering of source(s) or from (an) altered source(s). Cf. *supra* nn. 30, 36, 39, 42 and text with n.72 *infra*.

<sup>44</sup> Cf. *Il.* 6.152–55, 196f, 209ff (*cf.* Kirk II 180f). On Xanthos *cf.* Hope Simpson and Lazenby (*supra* n.38) 179; Bryce (*supra* n.13) 23, who finds some difficulty explaining the presence of the Lycians at Troy as a result of the absence of remains. Kirk I 262, on the other hand, states that "it is a mistake to be concerned" about this absence of evidence, as "little exploration for early settlement-sites in other parts of the valley has been carried out so far." This ignores, however, the fact that the excavations of the acropolis, the likeliest place for earliest habitation-concentration in the valley because of its strategic and

the *Iliad* implies the absence of a hostile tradition that intensive warfare would have spawned; much of what became Ionia, on the other hand, was apparently taken from the Carians and, where intermarriages and other mitigations for hostilities did not obtain, may have been hard won.<sup>45</sup> Yet, as we have seen, Homer's ridicule and disdain for the Carians was not reflective of realities in southwestern Anatolia even as early as the Ionian migration: variant traditions and subsequent historical information make this clear enough. Such racial animosities as emerge in Homer must have dimmed considerably if they did not vanish altogether by Archilochus' time. The very negative Homeric tradition on Carians is not consistent with other, more historical data: it appears in fact to be an artifact of hostility from well before the eighth century B.C.

### III

A contrary tradition, current among the Ionians no later than the second quarter of the seventh century B.C., depicts the Carians as estimable warriors, not at all the inconsequential combatants of the *Iliad*. This appraisal emerges most clearly in Herodotus' *Histories*, himself a direct heir to Ionian traditions, and would thus seem, at least partially, based on fact. It designates the Carians, not the Lycians, in Egypt as the most famous of historical *epikouroi*.<sup>46</sup> On this evidence, the Carians, fighters by choice and all but professionals, travelled long distances to fight; the Greeks credited them with both the introduction of hoplite armaments and, as we have seen, the invention of fighting for

---

defensive possibilities, were carried down to bedrock in some places: cf. Hope Simpson and Lazenby.

<sup>45</sup> Sarpedon's slaying of Tlepolemus of Rhodes (5.627ff) is sometimes taken to amount to historical evidence of conflict between Greek Rhodians and barbarians Lycians (cf. Kirk II 122, 180f), but Sarpedon, like Glaucus, is contrived by Homer—and obviously the tradition(s) he followed—to be of Achaean stock after all. Cf. *supra* nn.15, 42–43 and n.50 *infra*. We note that Homer does not deride the Lycians or any other group; rather he singles out the Carians: cf. *supra* nn.30–34, 42 (Σ*ad Il.*).

<sup>46</sup> Carians most famous later: cf. Hdt. 2.61, 152, 154; Ephorus, *FGrHist* 70F12; Strab. 14.2.28 (662C); see also n.47 *infra*.

pay.<sup>47</sup> The tradition of Carian proficiency in warfare, tied to what Herodotus at least took as fact, implicates the Carians as military models for the eastern Greeks at least from the mid-seventh century. They remained so until the Persian Wars.

Herodotus emphasizes Carian fighting skills and valor in a memorable episode of the Cypriot uprising during the Ionian Revolt in 499 (5.111). An anonymous Carian *hypaspistes*, but "esteemed for warcraft and otherwise full of spirit" (τὰ δὲ πολεμία κάρτα δόκιμος καὶ ἄλλως λήματος πλέος), created a stratagem for his commander. Artybius, the Persian commander, possessed a remarkable horse, trained to rear up and attack enemies with its hooves. Anticipating single combat with Artybius, Onesilus, the tyrant of Salamis and leader of the rebels, sought the advice of his Carian *hypaspistes*. The Carian advised Onesilus to concentrate upon the rider, Artybius, while he would manage the horse. The Carian unselfishly allocated the glory of single human combat to his commander, while he took on the inglorious but necessary task of dealing with the prodigious horse. In the ensuing fight Onesilus dispatched Artybius, and the Carian sheared off the hooves of the rearing horse with his curved *drepanon* as it was about to come down upon the shield of Onesilus.

In this unique combat, Homeric in flavor and highlighted by Herodotus, the Carian and Onesilus actually change places of respect. Herodotus' focus is less upon the tyrant, even though he is ostensibly the nobler of the Greek combatants, than upon the anonymous Carian *hypaspistes*, who demonstrates conspicuous strategic sense, fighting skill, and courage, but also notable chivalry and nobility of spirit by deferring the more traditionally honorable combat to Onesilus. Herodotus' Carian *hypaspistes* could not on the basis of this account be called a 'mercenary': there is no hint of him serving for pay.<sup>48</sup> Rather,

<sup>47</sup> As inventors of weapons: Hdt. 1.171.4; Strab. 14.2.27; cf. How and Wells 132; Lorimer (*supra* n.42) 193 with n.204, 204 with n.3, 238, 292 with n.1; A. M. Snodgrass, "Carian Armourers—The Growth of a Tradition," *JHS* 84 (1964) 107ff, who doubts the tradition as rationalization; cf. Fourgous 1142ff; Bettalli 109f; cf. also on hoplite warfare M. M. Sage, *Warfare in Ancient Greece* (London 1996) 25–28; as inventors of the mercenary profession: see *supra* n.28. Whether the Carians were in fact the 'inventors' of hoplite weapons or the mercenary profession is not consequential here: the Greeks of Herodotus' time thought they were, and this supports the conclusion that they were renowned warriors among the Greeks: cf. nn.49, 74 and text *infra*.

<sup>48</sup> Cf. Hornblower 21; and B. M. Lavelle, "Herodotus on the Argives of Kourion," *AJP* 112 (1984) 249–52 on the Homeric overtones of the episode.

the Carian's superior knowledge of warfare is featured and he becomes a paragon of the new military virtue, albeit in the manner of Homer's Sarpedon or Glaucus: like his Lycian counterparts in the *Iliad*, he is the soldier's soldier because he does what needs to be done (*cf. Il.* 12.310–28). Such deferential, admirable military behavior is not at all in line with Homer's depiction of the Carians, but it does conform to other historical evidence, as we shall soon see. It becomes increasingly apparent why Archilochus, who knew soldier from soldier, would take notice of the Carians in fr. 216.

Herodotus' story suggests several things about Carians. First, the unnamed Carian is to be taken as a type; his anonymity makes his actions generic and recognizable as such. Included in that type were military skill (Onesilus, the commander, turned to the Carian for his experience in warfare) hard sense, and conspicuous valor. Indeed, the Carian fought with considerable *esprit*. Second, the Carian had travelled some distance from his homeland to serve against the Persians in Cyprus. This information accords with the Carians' reputation as fighters who left their own country to fight for others. Finally and most significantly, Herodotus' account of the battle suggests that Carian *epikouroi* quite literally "fought alongside," just like the *hypaspistes* with Onesilus and Homer's Lycians with the Trojans. Thus, although the anonymous Carian *hypaspistes* in Herodotus' story may have been invented, his characterization must have been based on the Carians' reputation among the Greeks as experienced, estimable warriors—that is to say, grounded in what Greeks actually thought about Carian *epikouroi*.<sup>49</sup> The Carians thus appear to have been reckoned in fact what the Lycians were portrayed to be in Homer's fiction.<sup>50</sup>

<sup>49</sup> *Cf.* Theoc. *Id.* 17.89: φιλοπολέμοισι τε Κάρσι (linked with Lycians); Strab. 14.2.28: καθ' ὅλην ἐπλανήθησαν τὴν Ἑλλάδα, μισθοῦ στρατεύσαντες; Ael. *NA* 12.30; see also R. Drews, "The First Tyrants in Greece," *Historia* 41 (1972) 140 n.46, 141 n.54; Hornblower 29 (on the performance of Carians during the Ionian revolt). There is no need to contrive elaborate explanations for Herodotus' favorable treatment of the Carians (*cf.* Hornblower 24; Fourgous 1149): that Herodotus was apparently half-Carian offers an easy solution to any question of favorable bias (*cf.* Hornblower 24; Fourgous 1150). Herodotus is, however, by no means alone in recognizing the Carians as dedicated warriors: *cf. supra* with n.46.

<sup>50</sup> Old traditions (fueling and perhaps fueled by local die-hard hatreds) and new realities spawned the duality of Greek views of the Carians (*i.e.*, noble and ignoble): obviously the former were vestiges and more apparent than real by the Archaic period. *Cf.* Fourgous 1142–62, however, for different views

The most memorable demonstration of Carian warfare in Herodotus—indeed, the first historical instance of long-distance *epikouria* noted by the Greeks—occurred during the mid-seventh century, the time of Archilochus' *floruit*.<sup>51</sup> According to Herodotus (2.152), some Carians and Ionians were freebooting in ships along the Egyptian coast very early in the reign of the pharaoh Psammetichus (Psamtik, 664–610). 'Forced' ashore, they began to plunder the countryside. Psammetichus, whose enemies had driven him into exile in the marshes, had subsequently heard from the oracle at Buto that "bronze men" would come from the sea and would be his *epikouroi* ("allies"). Informed of the freebooters' ravaging, Psammetichus met and offered them "great things" (μεγάλα) if they would "ally with him" (μετ' ἑωυτοῦ γενέσθαι).<sup>52</sup>

These freebooters—to all appearances pirates out for plunder—became "fighters for pay" as soon as they accepted ser-

---

about the "deux images bien différentes" of the Carians (*cf.* Bettalli 110 n.27). Frei (*supra* n.13) suggests that Sarpedon's rôle in the *Iliad* was purely Homeric invention, but that the Lycian was made over to the Greek epic from a regional one seems more tortuous than assuming that Homer (or his sources) introduced a contingent of famed fighters from his region and "sanitized" them by renaming them "Lycians"; *cf.* Hainsworth 350, who notes that the Classical Lycians called themselves *Termilai*, not Lycians. *Cf.* also *supra* nn.15, 42, 43.

<sup>51</sup> Archilochus' references to Gyges (fr. 19W) and to the destruction of Magnesia-on-the-Maeander (fr. 20W) are taken consensually to date his *floruit* to the mid-seventh century: see F. Jacoby, "The Date of Archilochos," *CQ* 35 (1941) 97–109; P. Green, *The Shadow of the Parthenon* (Berkeley 1972) 268–75; H. D. Rankin, "Archilochus' Chronology and Some Possible Events of His Life," *Eos* 65 (1977) 5–15; *cf.* Rankin (*supra* n.20) 25–28; A. A. Mosshammer, *The Chronicle of Eusebius and the Greek Chronographic Tradition* (Cranbury, NJ 1979) 210–17; Bettalli 105 n.9. *Cf.* H. Kaletsch, "Zur lydischen Chronologie," *Historia* 7 (1958) 25f with n.55, however, on the relevance of Archilochus fr. 19 to Lydian chronology; see also n.60 *infra* on the range of death-dates proposed for Gyges. On the Ionian-Carian expedition to Egypt see n.52 *infra*.

<sup>52</sup> Hdt. 2.152.4f; on the expedition and subsequent Carian and Greek presence in Egypt see Parke (*supra* n.20) 4ff; Austin 15ff; O. Masson, "Les Cariens en Égypte," *BullSocFrÉgypt* 56 (1969) 25–36; A. B. Lloyd, *Herodotos, Book II (Introduction)* (Leiden 1975) 14ff; T. F. R. G. BRAUN, "The Greeks in Egypt," *CAH* III.3<sup>2</sup> (1982: hereafter 'Braun') 35ff; Hornblower 354–57; Bettalli 94ff; and S. Pernigotti, "Greci in Egitto e Greci d'Egitto," *Ocnus* 1 (1993) 125ff. The likeliest date of the Carian-Ionian expedition appears to be early 663 (*cf.* Austin 15; Hornblower 354), although late 664 is just possible: see text with nn. 54, 62 *infra*. On Greek and Carian piratical descents upon Egypt before the Carian-Ionian expedition see n.53 *infra*.

vice with Psammetichus.<sup>53</sup> They obviously owed no allegiance to this apparently hard-put princeling and their only motivation must have been the substantial rewards he offered. Redirecting their appetite for battle, Psammetichus first employed the Carians and Ionians to settle affairs in the Delta and then, in 656, to reunite Egypt.<sup>54</sup> The foreign *epikouroi*, along with others who

<sup>53</sup> Cf. Strab. 17.1.6 on early Greek "ravagers" feared by the Egyptian pharaohs. Austin (12) adduces other earlier evidence (e.g. *Od.* 14.245–86) for Greek and Cretan piracy against the Egyptians and links it with Herodotus' information about the Carian expedition; cf. Braun 35; *contra*, Bettalli 58f; cf. Pernigotti (*supra* n.52)126ff. In view of the evidence, it is less likely that Herodotus' story of the piratical landing in Egypt was inspired by the *Odyssey* than that actual piratical descents did occur: Thucydides (1.4, 8.1) links the Carians with piracy in the Aegan and the Cretans with the Carians (cf. Gomme 106ff), a connection made by other ancient authors: see *supra* n.35. On Greek piracy see now P. de Souza, "Greek Piracy," in A. Powell, ed., *The Greek World* (London 1995) 179–98, who (180) distinguishes piracy ("armed robbery involving the use of a ship") from warfare (which has "political objectives like the conquest of territory"): the first Carian and Ionian *epikouroi* are unlikely to have been out for land to settle on in Egypt: cf. text with n.62 *infra*.

<sup>54</sup> Psammetichus' fortunes seem to have been at lowest ebb after Tantamani's temporary successes, which included the execution of Psammetichus' father Necho of Sais (early 664), and before the return of the Assyrians: cf. K. Kitchen, *The Third Intermediate Period in Egypt (1100–650 B.C.)* (Warminster 1986) 400ff; A. SPALINGER, "Psammetichos, King of Egypt," *JARCE* 23 (1976: hereafter 'Spalinger') 133ff. Psammetichus fled initially to the Assyrians (cf. Hdt. 2.152.1), who subsequently restored him to rule over the Delta kingdom of the west (*i.e.*, Sais), but after their withdrawal he seems to have gotten into major trouble with the other Delta rulers (cf. Hdt. 2.152.2; Kitchen 400ff; Spalinger, 137f). All this presumably occurred before the end of 664, officially reckoned the first year of Psammetichus' reign (cf. Kitchen 550). Thereafter, however, Psammetichus' power increased dramatically, an increase surely linked to his employment of the *epikouroi* (Kitchen 402). Psammetichus eliminated his Delta rivals and was strong enough within eight years to proceed with reunification of all Egypt (Spalinger 138f).

The likeliest time for Psammetichus' enlistment of the *epikouroi* was shortly after the Assyrian withdrawal from Egypt. His power was still shaky, and he could not count on the Assyrians, who were too far away and whose incursions into Egypt were ineffectual in the long run anyway. As the Assyrians were unhelpful—their recent destruction of Thebes must have made them quite despicable to the Egyptians (pace Spalinger)—and as the Egyptians were divided against themselves, Psammetichus turned to outsiders to gain the upper hand in the Delta (cf. Kitchen 400ff; Spalinger 135). Psammetichus need not by any means have thrown off the pretense of loyalty to Assurbanipal immediately and was perhaps given leave by the Assyrians to eliminate the other, less loyal Delta kings. Cf. D. D. Luckenbill, *Ancient Documents of the Near East* (Chicago 1927) 298; Kitchen 402 n.934; A. Spalinger, "Assurbanipal and Egypt: A Source Study," *JAOS* 94 (1974) 316–28, and "The Date of the

arrived in the wake of the initial contingent, became a standing force for Psammetichus and his successors stationed permanently in Delta camps.<sup>55</sup>

Later testimonies, along with Assurbanipal's observance that the accursed "Gugu" (Gyges) sent "his forces" to Psammetichus' aid, have engendered beliefs in more formal, perhaps even regular dispatches of mercenaries from Caria to Egypt and that Psammetichus had first obtained *epikouroi* upon request from Gyges.<sup>56</sup> Diodorus (after Hecataeus of Abdera?) says that Psammetichus summoned (μεταπεμψάμενος) Carian and Ionian *misthophoroi* (a more precise term for "mercenaries") from Anatolia.<sup>57</sup> Polyaeus also notes that Psammetichus introduced (προσήγαγεν) Carians into Egypt.<sup>58</sup> Add to that Plutarch's testimony that Arselsis of Mylasa, Caria's principal city, came as an *epikouros* for Gyges and the plausibilities arise that Gyges could count on Carian *epikouroi* to do his bidding and that Psammetichus obtained requested mercenaries from the Lydian *tyrannos*.

This view, however, has several flaws—especially that, except for Assurbanipal's contemporary accusation, these accounts postdate and are made fundamentally to disagree with Herodotus', who has the *epikouroi* initially embarked for piracy and their landing unarranged: they would hardly have begun plundering their employer's land otherwise. Herodotus' ignorance

---

Death of Gyges and its Historical Implications," *JAOS* 98 (1978) 402f; see also text with n.59 *infra*.

<sup>55</sup> Hdt. 2.154.3; *cf.* Diod. 1.66.12; Polyaeus. *Strat.* 7.2.3; see also Austin 15ff, who wisely cautions that these Carians and Ionian *epikouroi* are not to be considered similar to Greek mercenaries of the fourth-century type: *cf.* text with n.57 and n.62 *infra*.

<sup>56</sup> Luckenbill (*supra* n.54) 197f; Austin 18: "There must surely have been some understanding previous to the settlement of the Greeks and Carians in Egypt." *Cf.* also Bettalli 58, 77. But *cf.* text with nn.61, 62 *infra*.

<sup>57</sup> 1.66.12: ὁ μὲν Ψαμμήτιχος ἐκ τε τῆς Καρίας καὶ τῆς Ἰωνίας μισθοφόρους μεταπεμψάμενος ἐνίκησε κτλ. *Cf.* A. Burton, *Diodorus Siculus, Book I: A Commentary* (Leiden 1972) 195f; Austin 53 n.4: "Diod. 1, 66 uses μισθοφόροι, which has the wrong associations altogether and shows that he (or his source) misunderstood the situation, for these mercenaries did not serve for *pay*." *Cf.* text *infra*. Hecataeus of Abdera as Diodorus' source for the Egyptians of his history: *cf.* Braun 32.

<sup>58</sup> 7.2.3: Ψαμμήτιχος ... πολλοὺς Κάρας ξενολοήσας προσήγαγεν κτλ. Braun (35) states that Polyaeus' story must derive from the fourth-century Aristagoras of Miletus (*cf.* *FGrHist* 608F9). Polyaeus' source may, however, have been Hecataeus of Teos/Abdera, the same as Diodorus: *cf.* Austin 55f n.4.



of a Gyges-Psammetichus agreement accords with a lack of ancient evidence to support actual Carian mercenary operations before the freebooters in Egypt turned to fighting for pay. Note, too, that Caria was not part of Gyges' Lydian domain and that Arselis of Mylasa, Gyges' *epikouros*, need not by any means have been a 'mercenary' to aid Gyges (*cf. supra* n.29). On the other hand, the vivid traditions of both Aegean freebooters' descents upon Egypt and Carians as pirates support independently Herodotus' version of events (*cf. supra* n.53). Finally, to discredit Herodotus's story—as we must do to accept such an interpretation of the later sources—some other creditable Greek source, bypassed or ignored by Herodotus, must be invented—a source that preserved information ultimately from an older Lydian or Egyptian source before reaching Ephorus/Diodorus *et al.* The problem of the transmission of such information, which, though valid, Herodotus disregarded or overlooked, seems quite insurmountable: Herodotus knew Ionian traditions very well, was positioned to be familiar with Carian traditions about the expedition, had himself visited Egypt, and presumably had as much and even greater access to whatever could have been Diodorus/Hecataeus' source. And, of course, he had no discernible motive for obscuring the truth.

A different view of the later evidence about the Egyptian expedition may conform with Herodotus' testimony. When the *epikouroi* arrived, Psammetichus had been for some time a co-operative of the Assyrians in the Delta, who restored him to the kingship late in 664. Inasmuch as Egypt was perpetually troublesome to the Assyrians and Psammetichus and his father had been faithful to Assyria, it is quite reasonable to assume that Assurbanipal gave leave to Psammetichus, either explicitly or tacitly, to reduce the Delta by whatever means when he departed Egypt with his Assyrians (*cf. Spalinger* 135f). Psammetichus was required—with the Assyrians gone—to find another military force to stabilize his position in the Delta and to reduce his enemies there. The *epikouroi* constituted an immediate, much more effective force than the absent Assyrians or even Psammetichus' own Egyptians: their weapons—and more, their proficiency with them—will have given them substantial advantage over the more lightly armed Egyptians. Psammetichus may have heard about their warlike character and capabilities, which seem to have been complemented by conspicuous loyalty once committed as *epikouroi*, or he may simply have taken a chance. In any case, the arrival of the Carians and Ionians gave Psam-

metichus the opportunity he needed, and he seized upon it. The real and final break with Assurbanipal need have occurred only later in 656 when Psammetichus, who had been successful in the Delta with the *epikouroi*, extended his suzerainty southward, thereby terminating Assyrian rule of Egypt. By then, Assurbanipal had every good reason to be very angry with his former vassal—and with any who seemed to cooperate with him.<sup>59</sup>

Psammetichus made the *epikouroi* a standing force for his personal use and undoubtedly owed his enhanced power to them: he will certainly have obtained reinforcements of *epikouroi* before turning south in 656. Such an augmentation would not have gone unnoticed by Assurbanipal, who then complained about Gyges and cursed him. That both the fulfillment of Assurbanipal's curse against Gyges and the king of Egypt's rebellion are cited make it much less likely that Assurbanipal's complaint refers to the initial contingent of Carians and Ionians, who arrived *ca* 664/663, than to reinforcements who helped Psammetichus after he had rebelled from Assyrian rule: that is, some time closer to 656, the date of Psammetichus' annexation of Upper Egypt.<sup>60</sup> By doing nothing to prevent Carian *epikouroi* from leaving his 'domain' in Anatolia, Gyges became Psammetichus' accomplice and ally in the eyes of a quite wrathful Assurbanipal. As Caria was not yet part of the Lydian empire, the Carians could not in any case have been Gyges' 'forces' to send in any literal sense.<sup>61</sup>

<sup>59</sup> On Psammetichus' good relations with Assyria early on *cf.* A. Spalinger, "The Concept of Monarchy during the Saite Period," *Orientalia* 47 (1978) 16ff, and *ib.* (1974: *supra* n.54) 316–26. Spalinger's thesis (1976 [*supra* n.54] 133f) that Assurbanipal somehow condoned Psammetichus' reunification of Upper and Lower Egypt, is weakened by the author's failure to deal adequately with Assurbanipal's complaint that Psammetichus had overthrown Assyria's yoke: see Luckenbill (*supra* n.54) and n. 61 *infra*; *cf.* A. T. Olmstead, *History of Assyria* (Chicago 1923) 416ff; Braun 37, who places Psammetichus' final assertion of independence against Assyria as late as the 640s. Bettalli (58 n.21), however, terms Braun's reconstruction fragile.

<sup>60</sup> *Cf.* M. Cogan and H. Tadmor, "Gyges and Ashurbanipal," *Orientalia* 46 (1977) 84; *cf.* Olmstead (*supra* n.54) 421f; Kaletsch (*supra* n.51) 29. Dates for the death of Gyges range from the mid-650s (Struwe, Diakonoff, Hartman) to 652 (Gelzer, Lehman-Haupt, Jacoby, Kaletsch) to later than the 650s (Cogan and Tadmor; Spalinger [1978 (*supra* n.54) 400–409]); *cf.* Tadmor and Cogan 78f n.25; Spalinger (1976 [*supra* n.54]) 136, 144; and *supra* n.51.

<sup>61</sup> *Cf. supra* n.29. Spalinger's assertion (135) that Gyges was cited and cursed by Assurbanipal *not* for allying with Psammetichus by sending warriors or for hostilities against Assyria, but for his hybriistic independence and for

It is certainly not difficult to accept that the Carians had taken the lead in the expedition to Egypt or that they preponderated in numbers initially.<sup>62</sup> Indeed, a Carian-led expedition to Egypt accords with what ancient authors said about Greeks and Carians before the arrival of the *epikouroi* in Egypt. Carians were famous for piracy and roaming the seas fighting and plundering; Aegean pirates in the past had raided Egypt, and the *epikouroi* were doing no more than that when confronted by Psammetichus (cf. *supra* nn.46, 49, 53). Although Greeks, on the other hand, had been energetic colonizers from well before the expedition to Egypt and obviously had to fight natives who opposed their colonies, they did not engage in organized long-distance fighting like the Carians. Thucydides says that the Greeks mounted no notable expeditions and fought no notable wars, except the Trojan and Lelantine Wars, before the Peloponnesian War, but fought primarily in border wars against their

---

not making an alliance with Assyria, is unpersuasive because it ignores not only the citation's implication with the revolt of Psammetichus, but also the explicitness of the Prism inscription. Cf. also Olmstead (*supra* n.59).

<sup>62</sup> Cf. Braun 44ff; Bettalli 56. Hornblower (354) terms the original Carians and Ionians *coloni* (cf. Austin 17), but that is an anachronism drawn from what the *epikouroi* to Egypt became (cf. *supra* n.55 and this note *infra*). Austin (18) terms Herodotus' account "somewhat misleading," stating that there must have been "some understanding previous to the settlement of the Greeks and Carians in Egypt." Herodotus implies, however, that the Carian and Ionian free-booters had come to Egypt to take what they could, not become Psammetichus' armed force: why would they plunder the land of their employer-to-be upon their arrival (cf. Hdt. 2.152.4) if the contract had been arranged? In the context of earlier attested piratical 'expeditions' and in light of Herodotus' testimony about it, the initial Carian-Ionian 'expedition' to Egypt was simply another Cretan/Carian-type of raid (cf. *supra* n.53). Perhaps Psammetichus, apparently very clever, seized upon the double expedient of saving his land and turning the plunderers to better use for himself. He had no other fighting force as effective at the time, as his predicament indicates. On the other hand, Herodotus notes that the Egyptians were xenophobic (2.79.1, 91.1), and extraordinary conditions must account for the accommodation of the *epikouroi* in Egypt. There are thus no positive indications that the *epikouroi* were in Egypt to stay from the outset; and even subsequent graffiti preserving the names of replacements and their Ionian cities, such as Teos, Ialysos, and Colophon, may indicate that many *epikouroi* came and went, even if they were given lands to farm (2.154.1; cf. 1.168.1): cf. R. Meigs and D. Lewis, ed., *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the End of the Fifth Century B.C.* (Oxford 1975) 12f; Bettalli 66ff; and n.67 *infra*.

neighbors.<sup>63</sup> Thucydides' statement indicates at least the absence of memorable Greek expeditions during the Archaic period. Ionian Greeks probably followed in greater numbers after the path-breaking initial expeditionaries to Egypt and Psammetichus' subsequent successes (*cf. supra* n.62), but surely owed their initial participation to the consent of the Carians. The latter were older hands at the business of piracy and expeditionary fighting, and were perhaps more familiar with Egypt; they were also well-respected as consummate warriors by the Ionians.

#### IV

To summarize the argument to this point, Homer, Archilochus, and Herodotus use ἐπίκουρος to refer to outstanding warriors of southwestern Anatolia. Though Homer uses *epikouroi* of the Lycians and derides the Carians, Archilochus and Herodotus describe the latter as *epikouroi*. In fact, the Carians are the most renowned of *epikouroi* from the seventh (Archilochus, Herodotus) to the early fifth centuries (Herodotus). Later ancient authors attest confusion between Lycians and Carians among historians and poets, and we have observed that "Lycian" was apparently consciously substituted for "Carian" in some traditions. There is a strong suspicion that this is so in the *Iliad*. In fact, it is far from unlikely that the negative tradition about the Carians preserved in and seconded by Homer authorized and even encouraged such changes. Carians, however, emerge from the seventh century as *epikouroi* of greater renown than any others. The Greeks apparently considered them preeminent warriors predisposed to warfare: whatever the value of the tradition in Herodotus about their invention of hoplite weapons, some Greeks, including the author apparently, believed it. Carians did travel some distance to "fight alongside" others, as their Egyptian sojourn shows; they were committed fighters when they arrived, as their loyalty to subsequent Egyptian kings attests. The Carian *hypaspistes* of the Cypriot portion of the Ionian revolt, an apparent warrior-archetype as portrayed in Herodotus, is conspicuously valorous and loyal far from home in the battle on the plains of Salamis.

<sup>63</sup> Border wars: Thuc. 1.15.2; *cf.* Gomme 126; Hornblower (*supra* n.40) 49; [Xen.] *Ath. Pol.* 2.5.

Of course, all this contradicts Homer's very poor estimation of the Carians. As the historical evidence points to the Carians as the most famous *epikouroi* later (while, outside Homer, the Lycians are unnoticed as *epikouroi*), and as the negative tradition about the Carians preserved in Homer can have altered the truth about them, the word *epikouros* is most reasonably associated with the Carians and their brand of fighting than with the Lycians. In light of the historical evidence, it seems quite likely that the tradition that Homer preserves disregarded the real reputation of the Carians or, rather, made it over to the Lycians, inverting it in the *Iliad* so as to portray the Carians as effeminate and cowardly. Circumstances that formed the context of the genesis of the tradition, presumably the Ionian migration, ordained the inversion in Homer.

Inasmuch as *epikouros* is not distinctly linked to *kouros* but is attached auspiciously and almost exclusively to non-Greek southern Anatolian warriors early on, it may well be that the word, like the concept, derived from the Carians and was borrowed by the Greeks at an early stage to refer to strong and resolute military allies. Indeed, as the term *epikouros* refers in Homer more to barbarians than Greeks, and as Archilochus links it specifically to Carians, it might best be taken as originally non-Greek. The Greek word for "ally" or, more literally, "fighter alongside" was *symmachos*, a far more precise Greek term than *epikouros* to describe one waging war with and on behalf of others.<sup>64</sup> *Epikouros*, applied by Homer to Sarpedon and Glaucus, and then by Archilochus to the Carians, denoted a special type of fighter, a vigorous ally who came from afar, fought steadfastly, and did so with both skill and élan. The type, semi-professional perhaps, may have been established and the borrowing actually occurred before the end of the Bronze Age.<sup>65</sup>

<sup>64</sup> Cf. Hesych. s.v. ἐπίκουρος, ἐπικουρίας, ἐπικουροί; Erbse (supra n.5); Chantraine (supra n.1) III 673 s.v. μάχομαι; cf. M. Trundle, "Epikouroi, Xenoi, and Misthophoroi in the Classical Greek World," *War and Society* 16 (1998) 1–12.

<sup>65</sup> This may perhaps be applied to understanding *e-pi-ko-wo* in the header of the Mycenaean 'o-ka'-Tablets (cf. supra nn.2, 6, 9–10): those sent to the coast are neither "watchers" or "lookouts" (pace Chadwick and Baumbach) nor simple "reinforcements" (pace Deroy and Negri), but higher caliber fighters who were dispatched to rally the defenses and stiffen resistance. Such warriors, who need not have been mercenaries by any means, but more proficient in arms and recognized as such (cf. *Il.* 4.379; supra n.11), would be just the type one expects would be deployed in critical military circumstances. One imagines that the Carians, inhabiting the busy coast of Ionia with its rocky inlets and deep bays, made more of a living as pirates and raiders of

Although *epikouroi* may have originally described first-rate warriors who travelled distances to fight for *philoï*, it came only later to denote “mercenary.” As already shown, no evidence indicates that *epikouroi* were mercenaries before Homer and the epithet’s non-material overtones in the *Iliad* seem to belie the possibility. The original meaning of *epikouros*, “fighter alongside” (=“ally”), remained strong into the fifth century, for even Herodotus and Thucydides use such words as *misthotoi* to qualify *epikouros* in contexts as late as the Peloponnesian War. These qualifiers indicate that *epikouros* had not evolved exclusively into “fighter for pay” even by the last quarter of the fifth century: in fact, *epikouros* seems never to have meant “mercenary” solely (cf. Lavelle, *supra* n.26). The word was replaced by others for “mercenary” around the end of the fifth century when the Peloponnesian War had made mercenaries commonplace in the Greek world.

I offer some further suggestions based on Herodotus’ account of the Carian-Ionian expedition to Egypt. This expedition marks the exact point when the originally non-Greek *epikouros* took on the added connotation of “fighter for pay” (=“mercenary”) for the Greeks because of what the Ionian *epikouroi* became. The Egyptian expedition was the first historical occasion in which Greeks observed that “fighters alongside” not only had traveled far afield, but also possessed no other incentive to fight than the “great things” offered by Psammetichus. By accepting pay, the Carian-led Ionian *epikouroi* became “mercenaries” of Psammetichus. The expedition, an unprecedented event, will have impressed especially the Ionians, because the Greeks linked it to the ‘opening’ of Egypt, a land hitherto closed to the them (Braun 32ff).

This ‘opening’ had far-reaching consequences for the Greeks. Herodotus’ report of the event, 200 years after its occurrence, is but a faint echo of the enormous cultural and commercial impact that sustained contact with Egypt made upon the Greeks from the mid-seventh century. The immediate manifestations of profound Egyptian cultural influence are to be found in Greek art and architecture from that time: Egyptian

---

shipping than did others in the Aegean (cf. *supra* n.53) and, as quasi-Vikings darting out and back from their nests, acquired their skills and reputations for fighting, as the Norsemen did in a later age (cf. L. Casson, *The Ancient Mariners*<sup>2</sup> [Princeton 1991] 45). Their loyalty—there is no specific word in Greek for “loyalty”—may have been tied to their particular warrior code.

statues were translated into the first *kouroi* and Egyptian temples into increasingly larger, lithic Greek ones.<sup>66</sup> The Greeks particularly admired Egypt's agricultural richness, which Herodotus characterizes as inexhaustible and the land as easy to cultivate and to reap. Carian and Ionian *epikouroi* who farmed in the Delta and perhaps traded with the Egyptians will have found guaranteed enrichment, as soldiers, supplemented by the wealth of the soil and their commerce; their military duty against the 'softer' Egyptian contingents of pharaoh's enemies must have been relatively light to begin with.<sup>67</sup> The occurrence of the name "Psammetichus" among the Greeks of the mainland indicates the further immediate impact of the Egyptian expedition upon Archaic Greece.<sup>68</sup>

The remarkable demonstration of the *epikouroi* in Egypt also changed soldiering for Ionian Greeks in particular, for it provided an attractive alternative to traditional *polis*-oriented wars and the uncertainties of colonial life. Now Ionian warriors like Archilochus could go to fertile, civilized Egypt and become *epikouroi* of the pharaoh. The rewards will have been impressive if only because they were relatively munificent and steady compared to other alternatives. And it all seemed to come with so much less risk. Indeed, the rather dirty, little border wars or campaigns that Archilochus and others were apparently forced to wage for Paros and Thasos in such inglorious theaters as the Thasian *peraia* were now replaced at least in their minds with Egyptian possibilities. The Carian-Ionian expedition of ca 664/663 and its follow-ups informed such soldiers that they were assured of greater reward for doing no more in Egypt than what

<sup>66</sup> Cf. Braun 55f for a synopsis of Egyptian influence on Greek visual arts; A. Stewart, *Greek Sculpture: An Exploration* (New Haven 1990) 108, and B. S. Ridgway, *The Archaic Style in Greek Sculpture*<sup>2</sup> (Chicago 1993) 33ff for Egyptian influence on Greek sculpture, specifically *kouroi*. On the cultural influences of Egypt cf. further J. Boardman, *The Greeks Overseas*<sup>2</sup> (London 1980) 141ff; J. M. Hurwit, *The Art and Culture of Early Greece* (Ithaca 1985) 179ff; Austin 35ff.

<sup>67</sup> Richness of Egypt: Hdt. 2.14.2; cf. Braun 33ff; 'softness' of easterners: Hdt. 9.122; cf. How and Wells II 336f; Greek merchants in Egypt: Braun 38ff; on Greek and Carian *epikouroi* in Egypt subsequent to the original expedition see further Parke (*supra* n.20) 4ff; Austin 15–24; Bettalli 59–63; cf. also Lloyd (*supra* n.52) 24ff.

<sup>68</sup> Cf. Arist. *Pol.* 1315d and Nic. Dam., *FGrHist* 90F54 on Psammetichus of Corinth; cf. also Hornblower 357 with n.35 on Egyptian names and "Egyptianizing" influences at Halicarnassus; Austin 52 n.1 on the appearance of the Greek name "Psammetichus," obviously derived from the pharaoh.

they were doing routinely at home for much less.<sup>69</sup> An enticing prospect, especially after 'Egyptian veterans' were heard back in the Ionian world. The Carian-Ionian expedition and its aftermath must have been very big news indeed in Ionia, especially to men like Archilochus. And the poet was very much attuned to current events.

In view of the renown that we expect the 'opening' of Egypt generated in its time, the Carian-Ionian expedition can hardly have been other than celebrated throughout the Greek world, especially by the warriors who participated in it. That is actually indicated by Herodotus' report, made some two centuries later, obviously from tradition about it.<sup>70</sup> In view of Archilochus' notable penchant for remarking upon important current events and topics, especially Ionian ones (e.g. the destruction of Magnesia, Gyges' wealth), it would be surprising indeed if the Egyptian *epikouria* went unnoticed in his poetry.<sup>71</sup> After all, unlike other events that affected Archilochus only obliquely if at all, this topical event had direct repercussions for him and his kind, the Ionian warriors who were his comrades or adversaries.

I suggest that Archilochus fr. 216 W is the poet's positive response to information about the renowned expedition. Fighting for pay, an occupation newly created by the Carians for the Ionian Greeks, must have been very noticeable and very welcome to such as Archilochus, who emphasizes the absence of Homeric glamour in campaigns around Thasos. If it did not offer Homer's type of glory, at least Egypt offered certain reward. Then again, serving together with the renowned Carian *epikouroi* may have presented a further attractiveness to such Greek fighters as Archilochus, for their reputation as warriors during the Archaic period was apparently very impressive and of long standing. Perhaps there was further prestige for Ionian warriors in being associated with them on their campaigns.

In that light, in the context of the mid-seventh century, Archilochus fr. 216 should be seen as an asseveration, not a self-

<sup>69</sup> Cf. frr. 22, 102, 228 W; see also A. J. Graham, "The Foundation of Thasos," *BSA* 73 (1978) 61-98; Burnett 26; cf. also B. M. Lavelle, "Archilochos Fr. 6 W and ξεινία," *CJ* 76 (1981) 197ff.

<sup>70</sup> On Antimenidas of Mitylene, the brother of Alcaeus, who waged war in Babylonia, see Campbell 61, 302f; Gerber 199f; Parke (*supra* n.20) 2f; Bettalli 49f.

<sup>71</sup> Cf. Campbell 137; on Archilochus' penchant see e.g. J. S. Clay, "Archilochus and Gyges: An Interpretation of Fr. 23 West," *QUCC* 53 (1986) 7-17.



loathing admission, that Archilochus, too, will be called an *epikouros* "like a Carian."<sup>72</sup> Whether it constituted a statement of fancy or resolve to go to Egypt is quite another question that cannot be settled on the present evidence: we do not know that Archilochus was ever a mercenary or even an *epikouros* in fact.<sup>73</sup> We can say positively, however, that the word *epikouros*, whose own context seems to have been southwestern Anatolia, connoted neither a coward *nor* a mere mercenary to Archilochus, but conjured the image of a conspicuously brave and accomplished warrior who willingly and even enthusiastically travelled to fight with and on behalf of others. The 'Carian' orientation toward warfare and the semi-professionalism that it fostered led to the invention of *Greek* mercenaries *ca* 663;<sup>74</sup>

<sup>72</sup> The positive tone of fr. 216 seems to me to be guaranteed by Archilochus' definite assertion: a positiveness is assured by the particles *kai de* (cf. J. D. Denniston, *Greek Particles* [Oxford 1954] 248) and the strong future *keklesomai*. One does not declare so emphatically what one wishes *not* to be called. Inasmuch as the most famous *epikouroi* in the epic tradition are Glaucus, Sarpedon, and the Lycians, Archilochus might perhaps have been having some further fun with Homer by substituting "Carian" for his audience where, influenced by the epic tradition, his friend Glaucus and/or that audience might well expect "Lycian." Cf. Drews (*supra* n.49) 140ff, who also views Archilochus' assertion as a positive one.

The Greeks' low esteem of the Carians, which is revealed in Athenian literature of the later fifth and early fourth centuries (cf. Eur. *Cycl.* 645; Pl. *Euthyd.* 285B-C with Σ [cf. *supra* n.30], *Lach.* 187B; Ar. *Av.* 764; cf. also Diod. 10.25.2f; Hornblower 9, 139 n.14), was undoubtedly due to bad relations between Athens and Caria in the late fifth century. Specifically, the Carians seemed to have reached some accord with the Persians and the Athenians were unsuccessful in attempting to reassert control over Caria during the Peloponnesian War: the Carians seem to have become outright enemies in fact. Cf. Hornblower 29ff; A. G. Keen, "Athenian Campaigns in Karia and Lykia during the Peloponnesian War," *JHS* 113 (1993) 152-57; N. Dunbar, ed., *Aristophanes. Birds* (Oxford 1995) 241.

<sup>73</sup> In fact, we do not know if Archilochus was ever a mercenary. Certainly fr. 216 does not prove it: see Drews (*supra* n.49) 141; and *supra* n.20.

<sup>74</sup> Ephorus' claim (*FGrHist* 701F12) that the Carians invented the mercenary profession may well be that of *primus inventor* (cf. E. L. Wheeler, "The *Hoplomachoi* and Vegetius' Spartan Drillmasters," *Chiron* 13 [1983] 6f with n.33; Bettalli 110f). It is also possible, however, that the Carian-Ionian expedition to Egypt provided the grounds for the assertion in that, when the mercenary profession was 'invented' for the Greeks, the Carians were *thought* from their reputations as long-distance fighters through the fifth century (cf. Hdt.) already to have engaged in it. The fact is, we do not know when or even if the Carians acted as mercenaries before the expedition, although Homer's positive use of *epikouroi* suggests that they did not (cf. *supra* nn.11, 20, 26, 29, 48, 49). It is to be noted that Ephorus' ascription ignores that the mercenary profes-

*epikouroi*, apparently applied initially to non-Greek “fighters alongside” (an earlier Bronze Age [non-Greek (=Carian?) word]), came also to connote Greek and barbarian “fighters alongside” (Late Bronze Age [*o-ka* Tablets], Homer [Lycians]), then Greek and/or barbarian “fighters for pay” (Archilochus fr. 216; Herodotus) because the Carian-Ionian expedition to Egypt—as reported in Herodotus—had altered its meaning to become inclusive of soldiers who fought for money as well as for the love of fighting.<sup>75</sup>

LOYOLA UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO  
November, 1998

---

sion already existed in the Near East: cf. S. Dalley, “Foreign Chariotry and Cavalry in the Armies of Tiglath-Pileser and Sargon II,” *Iraq* 47 (1985) 31–48. What Psammetichus did in hiring foreign soldiers was not a new thing in the world, but it was new to the Greeks.

The meaning of *Yauna-Yawan* (= *Yamana-Yaman*), apparently applied to soldiers in Levantine contexts in the later eighth and early seventh centuries (cf. Bettalli 46–49), is quite uncertain.

The notion that Carian mercenarism was somehow created by the fact that Caria “was a place to get away from” (e.g. Hornblower 4; cf. Bettalli 111) seems to me to have been spawned from circularity: because the Carians were mercenaries, Caria must be an impoverished, undesirable place. In fact, it was/is not that at all. Of course Egypt was/is much wealthier.

<sup>75</sup> Cf. *supra* nn.17, 18, 47, 48. I thank the anonymous referee for *GRBS* for providing helpful and stimulating comments, and Everett L. Wheeler for communicating an invaluable reference.