

INDIVIDUALS, CITIZENS AND COLLECTIVITY IN ARCHILOCHUS*

Paula da Cunha Corrêa¹

Abstract

This paper examines the concepts and terms employed for individuals (proper and ethnic names), citizens (*astoí, polítai*), and the collectivity (*dēmos*, ethnic names) in the fragments of Archilochus.

Keywords

Archilochus, citizens, collectivity, Archaic Greek poetry

Resumo

Neste trabalho são examinados os conceitos e as expressões para os indivíduos (nomes próprios e gentílicos), os cidadãos (*astoí, polítai*), e a coletividade (*dēmos*, gentílicos) nos fragmentos de Arquíloco.

Palavras-chave

Arquíloco, cidadãos, coletividade, poesia grega arcaica

* The Portuguese version of this paper was presented at the XI Congress of the Brazilian Society of Classical Studies (SBEC) at the University of São Paulo, Dec. 4th, 2017.

¹ Associate Professor, University of São Paulo, São Paulo, Brazil. E-mail: correa@usp.br

The fragments of Archilochus are populated by a profusion of individuals, which can be characters based on historical people or not, heroes, gods and other mythical beings. Among the gods one counts Zeus², Demeter³, Dionysus⁴, Apollo⁵, Hephaestus⁶, Aphrodite⁷, Ares⁸, Enyalios⁹, Poseidon¹⁰, a Muse (Fr. 1.2 *IEG*) and the titan Tantalus (Fr. 91.14 *IEG*). Of the heroes, we hear of Deianeira (Fr. 286-8 *IEG*) and Heracles (Fr. 259, 286-9, 324.2 *IEG*), Erymas (Fr. 25. 8 *IEG*), Pyrrhus and Eurypylus (Fr. 304? *IEG*), Telephus (P.Oxy. 4708) and of creatures such as Nessus (Fr. 286, 288) and Achelous (Fr. 286-7 *IEG*).

A companion and friend who is not spared of the poet's satire is Glaucus, son of Leptines. The discovery and publication of the inscription of Glaucus of Thasos (SEG 14.565; 1T Gerber, 1999) confirmed that behind this character mentioned six times in Archilochus' extant fragments¹¹ lived a historical figure, mocked in fragment 117 *IEG* for his elaborate hairdo:

117: Schol. (b) T Hom. Il. 24.81: "βοὸς κέρασ". Οἱ δὲ νεώτεροι κέρασ τὴν συμπλοκὴν τῶν τριχῶν ὁμοίαν κέρατι.
τὸν κεροπλάστην ἄειδε Γλαῦκον
Ἀρχίλοχος.

Schol. (b) T Hom. Il. 24.81: Later authors use the word horn to describe the horn-like intertwining of the hair.

sing of Glaucus who arranges his hair in horns

So Archilochus."¹²

However, the most widely known characters satirized by Archilochus are Lycambes¹³, Amphimedo (Fr. 196^a.10 *IEG*) and their daughters, Neoboule (Fr. 118, 196^a.24 *IEG*) and her younger sister (Fr. 196^a *IEG*), whose

² Fr. 25.6, 91.30, 91?, 94.2, 98.7, 13, 122.2, 131.2, 154.5, 157.2, 177.1, 197, 230, 298.1 *IEG*.

³ Fr. 169, 322.1 *IEG*.

⁴ Fr. 120.1, 251.1 *IEG*.

⁵ Fr. 26.5 *IEG*.

⁶ Fr. 9.11, 108 *IEG*.

⁷ Fr. 112.11, 113.6? *IEG*.

⁸ Fr. 3.2, 10.8?, 18, 110 *IEG*.

⁹ Fr. 1 *IEG*.

¹⁰ Fr. 12.1, 192 *IEG*.

¹¹ Fr. 15, 48.7, (96), 105.1, 117, 131.1 *IEG*.

¹² In this English version of the paper, all translations of Archilochus (fragments and sources) are by Gerber (1999).

¹³ Fr. 38, 54.8, 60.2?, 71.1, (172-81 Test.), 172.1 *IEG*. See also Lycambes' patronymic, Dotades (Fr. 57.7, 151.3? *IEG*). For the possible meanings of the name Lycambes, see Pickard-Cambridge (1927: 15), West (1974), Nagy (1979) and Miralles-Pòrtulas (1983).

significant names may or may not have served the poet as cover for an attack on members of an actual Parian. Besides the Lycambids, there are many typical characters, such as the glutton Charilaus, son of Erasmon (Fr. 168 *IEG*):

Ἐρασμονίδη Χαρίλαε,
χρῆμά τοι γελοῖον
ἔρέω, πολὺ φίλταθ' ἑταίρων,
τέρμει δ' ἀκούων.

Charilaus, son of Erasmon,
by far the dearest of my companions,
I shall tell you something funny and
you will be delighted to hear it.

Just as Lycambes, Neoboule, Amphimedo, Cerycides (Fr. 185 *IEG*), Pasiphile (Fr. 331 *IEG*, a friend to all, *pasi-phílē*) and Leophilus (Fr. 115 *IEG*), Charilaus (Fr. 168 *IEG*) seems to have been a significant codename¹⁴.

At the beginning of this fragment, that may also have been the beginning of the poem, the speaker refers to his addressee by means of a name and patronymic that suggest somebody who is the “grace” or “pleasure of the troops” (*kháris* + *laós*). Likewise, the patronymic “son of Erasmon”, while imitating the elevated diction of epic, is also suggestive. Some translate it as “son of pleasant”, or “Darlingson” (Gerber, 1999), but it could have had more erotic connotations, as in Bonnard (“Fils de l’Amour”¹⁵) and in this case perhaps the “funny thing” to be told may be a story involving somebody whose voraciousness may not have been exactly for food.

Nagy (1979: 91ff) compared the name of Achilles (*Akhi-lāuos), as one whose *laós* suffers, with *Kharí-lāuos, one whose *laós* rejoices. Nagy relates the patronymic to the “bloom of youth that inspires poetry” (as in Anacreon Fr. 375 *PMG*), the verb *téropmai* (“to give/receive pleasure”) “conventionally designates the effect of poetry”. Odysseus (*Od.* 9. 3-11) says there is no greater *kháris* than to dine and listen to the singer, and so Charilaus will also enjoy the pleasure of the banquet, as the “dearest of

¹⁴ Schneidewin (1838) disposed fragments 168, 170, 171, and 169 *IEG* in a same group (although separated by asterisks), as Bergk (1882) had Fr. 168, 171, 170, and 169 *IEG*. Bergk’s (1882) ordering of the fragments was followed by Fick (1882), Hoffmann (1898) Diehl (1926¹, 1936², 1952³), Treu (1959), Tarditi (1968) and Adrados (1990³). Lasserre’s (1958) disposition was adopted by West (1971¹, 1989²) and Gerber (1999). The fragments do not present great textual difficulties, but have been considered strophic and placed among the epodes by West (1971¹, 1989²) and Gerber (1999) or not, according to the interpretation of the meter described by Hephaestion. Cf. Itsumi (2007).

¹⁵ Bonnard (1958): “Fils de l’Amour, Charilaos, jè veux te dire une chose plaisante, ô le plus cher dès amis, et tu serás ravi de l’entendre.”

companions". Nagy concludes that Archilochus' epode (Fr. 168 *IEG*) was directed to *phíloi* in a symposium¹⁶.

The idea that Charilaus and the patronymic are significant goes back to Liebel (1812), in the least, and many have observed that this is one of the characteristics that Archaic Iambi share with Old Comedy¹⁷. A fragment of Cratinus' comedy named *The Archilochuses* (11 K-A Ἐρασμονίδῃ Βάθιππε τῶν ἄωρολέων, "O Bathippus, son of Erasmon, with the smooth chin of a boy."¹⁸) seems to refer to this poem (Fr. 168 *IEG*) of Archilochus. If the patronymic ridicules Bathippus' "luxurious nature"¹⁹, the adjective *aōróleios*, in the sense of that which is unnaturally smooth (unlike a boy's naturally smooth chin), can allude to older men who shear their beards in order to appear prepubescent and thus attract lovers. This same theme might have been present in Archilochus.

The relation of the speaker to Charilaus is not evident. We do not know whether they were friends, or if the designation of Charilaus as "*by far the dearest of my companions*" is ironical, for while patronymics in elevated genres are "honorable and solemn", in iambic poems they are frequently mocking²⁰. Rosen (2007: 26, n. 37) says:

It has been suggested that many iambographic *psógoi* jámbicos were composed to be performed in the presence of the targets themselves, and not Always for the purpose of actually injuring them. This notion imagines that the audience, poet, and target alike formed a relatively closed group of *phíloi*, who enjoyed the comic entertainment of creative mutual banter.²¹

What was this "funny thing"? Gentili (1998: 189) supposes a humorous reproach or jesting aimed at a fellow symposiast, and that the funny thing was the dear companion's "polyphagia", Charilaus' "voracious appetite"²². That there are many apostrophes in Archilochus, but particularly in the introduction of fables, favors the hypothesis that this "funny thing" was a

¹⁶ For Kantzios (2005: 24) Fr. 168 *IEG* would also have been part of "friendly bantering in social gatherings".

¹⁷ Cf. Rosen (1988).

¹⁸ Translated by Storey (2011) who notes that "Bathippus is a documented Athenian name in the 4th c."

¹⁹ Cf. Meineke 1.22, Kock 1.15 *apud* Rosen (1988: 43).

²⁰ Cf. Gentili and Catenacci (2007).

²¹ Nagy (1979: 244-45) quotes Archilochus Fr. 168 *IEG* in this respect.

²² Hauvette (1905: 177) believed the "funny thing" was an anecdote, following perhaps Liebel (1812) that identified it" with the anecdote of Aethiops, the Corinthian, in Archilochus Fr. 293 *IEG*. According to Martino and Vox (1996: 645), the funny thing is buffoonery, for Treu (1959), "it's not a fable, neither a myth, but perhaps a real event". Among so many uncertainties, Bowie (2001: 19) observes that "the clearest point to emerge from the fragments is how the poet draws attention to his role as a story-teller".

fable. The chorus of elders in Aristophanes' *Lysistrata* begins to tell a fable in a very similar manner²³:

μῦθον βούλομαι λέξαι τιν' ὑμῖν, ὃν ποτ' ἤκουσ'
αὐτὸς ἔτι παῖς ὄν.
v. 784/5 οὕτως ἦν νεανίσκος Μελανίων τις,

I want to tell you all a tale that once I heard
when but a lad.
In olden times lived a young man named Melanion.²⁴

In Aristophanes' *Wasps* (566), Philocleon refers to Aesop's fables as a "funny thing": "Others tell us stories, others something funny (*ti géloion*) from Aesop."²⁵ According to Rankin (1977, p. 92):

In fragment 162 T [= 168 IEG] Archilochus also uses the technique and mannerism of the story-teller (...). The poet uses epic phrases, but the style is that of a *logos*; one man is going to tell a story to another, whether it be some anecdote about actual people, or some fable dealing with 'certain' animals (...).

According to Athenaeus (*Deipn.* 4. 167d), another glutton named in Archilochus' extant fragments is Aethiops, the Corinthian (Fr. 293 IEG) that exchanged the land he was entitled to in Syracuse for a honey cake. Nothing else is heard of him.

Three other characters, Eurymas, Melesander (?) and a herdsman called Phalangios are mentioned in an Oxyrhyncus papyrus fragment in which sexual preferences of Melesander and the herdsman seem to be discussed in the first four verses (Fr. 25 P. Oxy. 2310 fr. 1 col. i.40-48, ed. Lobel):

Ἰτις ἀνθρώπου φύη,
ἀλλ' ἄλλος ἄλλωι καρδίην ιαίνειται.
].τ[.]. Μελησά[νδρω]ι σάθη
]ε βουκόλωι Φαλ[αγγ]ιωι.
5 τοῦτ' οὐτις ἄλλ]ος μάντις ἀλλ' ἐγὼ εἶπέ σοι·
]γάρ μοι Ζεὺς πατήρ Ὀλυμπίων
ἐ]θηκε κάγαθὸν μετ' ἀνδράσι
οὐ]δ' ἄν Εὐρύμας διαψέγο[ι

²³ Zanetto (2001: 69).

²⁴ Translated by Henderson (2000). Zanetto (2001: 68-9) quotes this passage and also *Lysistrata* (vv. 805-20). Batezzatto (2009: 139), proposing a different reading: recognizing Homeric echoes in Archilochus Fr. 168 IEG, he suggests that it is not the beginning of a fable, but a parody of the *Iliad* 1.1-2.

²⁵ Aristophanes, *Wasps* v. 566: οἱ δὲ λέγουσιν μύθους ἡμῖν, οἱ δ' Αἰσώπου τι γέλοιον, translation by Henderson (1998). See Zanetto (2001: 69) for this reference and also Aristophanes' *Wasps* 1259-1260.

. . . human nature, but different people are warmed at heart by different things
. . . for Meles(ander) prick . . . for the herdsman Phal(ang)ios. I, (no other)
prophet, proclaimed (this) to you . . . for to me Zeus father of the Olympians . .
. made and good among men . . . (nor) would Eurymas find fault.

Of the kings and leaders that figure in the fragments of Archilochus, the most well-known is Gyges, king of Lydia. The poem (Fr. 19 *IEG*) appears to form a priamel, a frequent rhetorical device in Archaic Greek poetry in which a series of values or objects are enumerated and then discarded in favor of a unusual or personal choice. For example, in Archilochus Fr. 114 *IEG* the speaker first describes a grand general that serves as a foil for the general he prefers and is quite different: small, bow-legged, planted firm on the ground but full of courage. It is also possible that in Archilochus 19 *IEG*, after a sequence of rejected things the speaker declared his preferences:

Fr. 19 *IEG* Plutarch (*de tranq. animi* 10 p. 470bc) εἶθ' οὕτως ἀεὶ τῶν ὑπὲρ ἑαυτοῦς
ἐνδεεῖς ὄντες οὐδέποτε τοῖς καθ' ἑαυτοῦς χάριν ἔχουσιν.

οὐ μοι τὰ Γύγεω τοῦ πολυχρύσου μέλει,
οὐδ' εἰλέ πώ με ζήλος, οὐδ' ἀγαιομαί
θεῶν ἔργα, μεγάλης δ' οὐκ ἐρέω τυραννίδος·
ἀπόπροθεν γάρ ἐστιν ὀφθαλμῶν ἐμῶν.

“Θάσιος γὰρ ἦν ἐκεῖνος.” ἄλλος δὲ τις Χίος, ἄλλος δὲ Γαλάτης ἢ Βιθυνὸς . . .

Accordingly, since they always lack what is beyond them, they are never grateful for what befits their station.

The possessions of Gyges rich in gold are of no concern to me, not yet have I been seized with jealousy of him, I do not envy the deeds of the gods, and I have no love of tyranny. That is beyond my sights.

“Yes, since he was a Thasian,” someone will say. Yet others, a Chian, Galatian, or Bithynian, are not content if . . .

Plutarch quotes these four verses of Archilochus in his treatise (*Moralia* 10. 470b) as an example of an attitude that, in his view, conduces to tranquility of mind (*euthymía*): “to examine, if possible, oneself and one’s fortunes, but if that is not possible, to observe persons of inferior fortune, and not, as most people do, compare oneself with those who are superior”²⁶. According to Plutarch (loc. cit.), the majority (*hoi polloi*) “through being always conscious that they lack things which are beyond them, they are

²⁶ Plutarch (*Mor.* 10.470a-b): καίτοι καὶ τοῦτο μέγα πρὸς εὐθυμίαν ἐστὶ, τὸ μάλιστα μὲν αὐτὸν ἐπισκοπεῖν καὶ τὰ καθ' αὐτόν, εἰ δὲ μὴ, τοὺς ὑποδεεστέρους ἀποθεωρεῖν καὶ μὴ, καθάπερ οἱ πολλοί, πρὸς τοὺς ὑπερέχοντας ἀντιπαρεξάγειν. Translations of Plutarch by Hembold (1939).

never grateful for what befits their station"²⁷.

Aristotle also quotes the beginning of this poem in the *Rhetoric* (Γ 17 p.1418b23) revealing a fact that Plutarch omitted or simply ignored: who speaks in these verses of Archilochus is Charon, a carpenter. With regard to the *ēthos* ("moral character"), Aristotle (loc. cit.) comments on the necessity of attributing the discourse to a another when one speaks of oneself (to avoid envy, a long discourse or contradiction), or to speak of another without being accused of being offensive or rude. As examples of this, the *Philippus* (4-7) and the *Antidosis* (132-39, 141-49) of Isocrates, the beginning of two poems of Archilochus (Fr. 19, 122 *IEG*) and verses of Sophocles' *Antigone* (vv. 683-709) are cited.

In the four trimeters of Archilochus Fr. 19 *IEG*, four objects are discarded by Charon with a final justification. First, the epithet *polýkhrysos* ("of much gold") qualifies Gyges and suggests that all his wealth is was Charon claims he doesn't interest him²⁸. Herodotus (I. 12) tells the story of how Gyges became king of Lydia (687-652 BC) and that Archilochus, his contemporary, mentioned him in iambic trimeters. The verses of fragment 19 *IEG* were soon identified as being those Herodotus referred to and this testimony served as one more evidence for the dating of Archilochus²⁹.

The opulence of Asiatic kingdoms was proverbial, as also the treasure of Gyges³⁰. Although Charon avows he doesn't care for such riches, neither for the deeds of gods and tyranny, the emphatic repetition of anaphoric negatives betray his disdain, as in the poem on the lost shield (Fr. 5 *IEG*: *tí moi mélei aspìs ekeinē*; "What do I care about that shield?")³¹.

The second verse begins with the anaphoric repetition of the negative and the *dzēlos* that Charon says has not gripped him. *Dzēlos*, that may be translated by "envy" or "jealousy", is generally employed in the positive sense (Chantraine, 1999², s.v.; *LSJ*). Unlike *phthónos*, *dzēlos* and its cognates are frequently an "admiration", "emulation", or "zeal" (cf. *zelus*)³². The verb *agaíomai* refers to the "the deeds of the gods" meaning "to admire" / "to

²⁷ Plutarch (*Mor.* 10. 470b): εἶθ' οὕτως ἀεὶ τῶν ὑπὲρ ἑαυτοῦς ἐνδεεῖς ὄντες οὐδέποτε τοῖς καθ' ἑαυτοῦς χάριν ἔχουσιν.

²⁸ *Polúkhrysos*, a rare epithet, qualifies Aphrodite (Hesiod, *Erga* 521) and a Teucrian herald in the *Iliad* (10. 315), both of Asiatic origins.

²⁹ Cf. Iuba Artigraphus (ap. Rufinum, *Gramm. Lat.* vi. 563. 18).

³⁰ Cf. Herodotus (I. 14) for the treasures Gyges sent to Delphi.

³¹ All *ancepi* are occupied by long syllables and the "gravity" transmitted by the rhythm may have an ironic effect in this case.

³² Chantraine (1999², s.v.). See Aristotle (*Rhet.* 1388b) for the distinction between *phthónos* ("envy") and *dzēlos* ("noble emulation"), but Hesiod (*Erga* 195) for *dzēlos* as "envy", and the *Odyssey* (5. 118 *dzēlémones*).

envy" (cf. *LSJ*), with the same ambiguity as *dzēlos*³³.

Charon concludes the negations by saying: "and I have no love of [the great] tyranny", in what Hippias (FGH 6F6)³⁴ holds to be the first reference to "tyranny". *Týrannos*, a term of Asiatic origins, is "the absolute ruler whose power is not limited by laws"³⁵. But in Archilochus, as in other Archaic Greek texts, a "tyranny" may correspond to a "reign" and in this case its qualification as "great" (*megálēs*) does not imply an absolute power, but one that is vast or extended, such as that of the great Asiatic kingdoms. It is not clear if "*týrannos*" in the seventh century could have a negative connotation, or not³⁶. In Archilochus (Fr. 23. 20-21 *IEG*), according to the supplements, somebody is exhorted to reign over the city (*ánasse*) and to be its "tyrant", for thus, "in truth you will be the envy (*dz]ēlōtós*) of many people"³⁷. Whether the tyranny in Archilochus Fr. 23. 20-21 *IEG* is a metaphor or not, it is something that rouses envy (*dzēlos*), while in fragment 19 *IEG* the verb used (*erēō*, "love") expresses a strong desire³⁸.

Finally, the justification for these denials is the carpenter's realist assertion that all of this is out of his reach ("beyond my sights")³⁹. If the poem ended at this point it would offer a good example of that which Plutarch proposes (*Mor.* 10.470bc). From the sixth century onwards the ideal of "civic tranquility" founded on the apology of moderation, of the "middle" (*tò méson*), becomes a commonplace, a *tópos* among poets⁴⁰. But if in the seventh century Archilochus did praise moderation in some of his verses, as in fragments 128 *IEG*, he still seems quite far from a Solon that insists on having refuted tyranny when it was offered to him⁴¹. Almost all commentaries on Archilochus Fr. 19 *IEG* suggest that Charon probably

³³ What are these "the deeds of the gods"? In the *Iliad* (16. 120) Ajax calls the deeds of Hector "*érga theōn*", as he perceives divine intervention, while in the *Odyssey* (1. 338), "*érga andrōn te theōn te*" are the subject matter of songs. In Archilochus, they might not be related to the deeds and offerings of Gyges (Gerber, 1970: 22).

³⁴ *Apud* Argum. in Soph. *Oed.Reg.* Cf. *Et. Gud.* (col. 537.26 Sturz), *Et. Magn.* (p.771.54 Gaisford); Schol. Aesch. *Prom.* 222 (Dindorf, p.17).

³⁵ Chantraine (1999², s.v.).

³⁶ Cf. Gerber (1970: 23), Andrews (1956: 20ss). Simonides (Fr. 584 *PMG*) *supra*.

³⁷ Fr. 23. 20-21 *IEG*: κείνης ἄνασσε καὶ τ[υραν]νίην ἔχε· | π[ο]λ[λοῖ]σ[ι] θ[η]ν[ζ]ηλωτὸς ἀ[νθρ]ώπων ἔσεται.

³⁸ Cf. Deioces, a "lover of tyranny" (*erastheis tyrannidos*), in Herodotus (1. 96. 2).

³⁹ Although the verb *estin* is in the singular, it may refer to all the fore mentioned objects, cf. De Falco and Coimbra (1941), Lasserre (1958), Tarditi (1968), Gerber (1970: 23); Fränkel (1975), Barron-Easterling (1985) and West (1993).

⁴⁰ Cf. Solon (Fr. 10. 2 *IEG*), Theognis (Fr. 219-20, 331-2, 335-6 *IEG*), Phocylides (Fr. 9 *IEG*). See also Pindar (*P.* 11. 50 ss.), where the poet says he wants that which is in his power, censuring tyranny and praising the "middle" (*tà mésa*).

⁴¹ Solon (Fr. 4c, 6, 32, 33, 34 *IEG*). For Pindar and Solon's aristocratic conservatism, cf. Gentili (1988: 149).

gave a final twist to the poem, and different hypotheses are offered⁴². A late imitation in the *Anacreontea* (8)⁴³ may give us a good clue:

οὐ μοι μέλει τὰ Γύγεω,
τοῦ Σάρδεων ἄνακτος·
οὐδ' εἶλέ πώ με ζῆλος,
οὐδὲ φθονῶ τυράννοις.
5 ἐμοὶ μέλει μύροισιν
καταβρέχειν ὑπήνην,
ἐμοὶ μέλει ρόδοισιν
καταστέφειν κάρηνα·
τὸ σήμερον μέλει μοι,
10 τὸ δ' αὔριον τίς οἶδεν;
ὥς οὖν ἔτ' εὐδι' ἔστιν,
καὶ πῖνε καὶ κύβευε
καὶ σπένδε τῷ Λυαίῳ,
μὴ νοῦσος, ἣν τίς ἔλθη,
15 λέγῃ, 'οὐ μὴ δεῖ πίνειν.'

I do not care about the wealth of Gyges, lord of Sardis: I have never envied him, and I have no grudge against tyrants. I care about drenching my beard with perfumes, I care about garlanding my head with roses; I care about today: who knows tomorrow? So while skies are still cloudless drink, play dice and pour libation to Lyaeus, lest some disease come and say, 'You must not drink.'⁴⁴

Another political leader in Archilochus is Leophilus. According to Aristotle, *Politics* 1305^a: "...in old times whenever the same man became both leader of the people (*dēmagōgós*) and general (*stratēgós*), they used to change the constitution to a tyranny; for almost the largest number of the tyrants of early days have risen from being leaders of the people⁴⁵. This offers a

⁴² Rankin (1977: 83), Fowler (1987: 72), Pippin-Burnett (1983: 67). Fränkel (1975: 138) suggests Charon doesn't care for a far-away king, but censures a dishonest local "nouveau-riche" and quotes as a parallel the criticism of Artemon by Anacreon (Fr. 388 PMG). Cf. Fränkel (1955: 57): "<wenn ich aber den NN in seinem übel erworbenen Reichtum und seiner unverdienten Herrlichkeit an meinem Neubau vorüberstolzieren sehe, so lauf mir doch die Galle über --> So sprach der Zimmermann Charon auf Thasos>. Cf. Horace (*Ep.* 4).

⁴³ Anacreon (Fr. 361 PMG), that develops a similar theme, is also mentioned by Fränkel (1975: 301, n. 28): ἐγὼ δ' οὔτ' ἂν Ἀμαλθίης | βουλοίμην κέρας οὔτ' ἔτεα | πεντήκοντά τε κάκατον | Ταρτησοῦ βασιλεῦσαι.

⁴⁴ Translation by Campbell (1988). This author of the *Anacreontea* Fr. 8 PMG could have based himself only on the first verses of Archilochus, and the original may have continued in a different manner; it could have had more erotic ending ("I do not care for Gyges (...) but for the woman...") or a more satiric one, censuring a friend or enemy. For other imitations or parodies of Archilochus Fr. 19 IEG see A. P. 9.110, Gregory Naz. *ad. animam suam* 84 sg; *Patr. Gr.* 37.683, 1435 Migne.

⁴⁵ Translation by Rackham (1944). Arist. (*Pol.* 1305a): ἐπὶ δὲ τῶν ἀρχαίων, ὅτε γένοιτο ὁ αὐτὸς δημαγωγὸς καὶ στρατηγός, εἰς τυραννίδα μετέβαλλον: σχεδὸν γὰρ οἱ πλεῖστοι τῶν

possible reading for Archilochus' Fr. 115 *IEG* on Leophilus, whose significant name means "dear to the troops" (*leós* + *phílos*):

Fr. 115 *IEG* "Herodian" *de figuris* (*Rhet. Gr.* viii.598.16 Walz, iii.97.8 Spengel)
πολύπτωτον δέ, ὅταν ἦτοι τὰς ἀντονομασίας ἢ τὰ ὀνόματα εἰς πάσας τὰς πτώσεις
μεταβάλλοντες διατιθώμεθα τὸν λόγον, ὡς παρὰ Κλεοχάρει . . . ἔστι δὲ τὸ
τοιούτον σχῆμα καὶ παρὰ τισι τῶν ποιητῶν, ὡς παρ' Ἀρχιλόχῳ καὶ Ἀνακρέοντι.
παρὰ μὲν οὖν Ἀρχιλόχῳ·

νῦν δὲ Λεώφιλος μὲν ἄρχει, Λεωφίλου⁴⁶ δ' ἐπικρατεῖν⁴⁷,

Λεωφίλῳ δὲ πάντα κεῖται, Λεωφίλον⁴⁸ δ' ἴακουε⁴⁹.

παρὰ δὲ Ἀνακρέοντι ἐπὶ τριῶν·

There is polyptoton whenever we arrange what is said by changing all the cases of pronouns or nouns, as in Cleocharis: . . . Such a figure is found also in some of the poets as in Archilochus and Anacreon. In Archilochus⁵⁰:

Now Leophilus is in charge, power rests with Leophilus, everything depends on Leophilus, and . . . Leophilus.

And in Anacreon with three cases."

In Archilochus Fr. 115 *IEG*, "Leophilus" may point to someone whose power was conferred to him by the troops (*laós*), to whom he is dear (*phílos*). Some historians believe that the tyrants in the archaic period emerged as military innovators or entrepreneurs that depended on the support of the troops to govern⁵¹. Thus, Gallavotti (1949: 71) suggests that these verses of Archilochus were directed against a "real *týrranos*". It is however possible that "Leophilus" was only a type or a codename for some popular general scorned by the poet.

ἀρχαίων τυράννων ἐκ δημαγωγῶν γεγονόσιν. "Tyrants" were also those who obtained power by "illegitimate", as Gyges (Herodotus 1.14). See also *Anthologia Palatina* 7.709. For Archaic Greek tyranny, cf. Aristotle (*Pol.* 5.1310b), Murray (1983: 132-43) and Andrews (1956: 20ss).

⁴⁶ Λεώφιλος Tarditi (1968)

⁴⁷ ἐπικρατέ <ε>ι Tarditi (1968)

⁴⁸ Λεώφιλος Tarditi (1968)

⁴⁹ ἀκούε<ται> Porson *apud* Tarditi (1968), ἀκούε<τε> Elmsley, ἀκούε<τω> Bergk.

⁵⁰ There is another polyptoton in Archilochus Fr. 177 *IEG*, where Zeus is first invoked and then referred to by the second person pronoun in the accusative, nominative, and dative cases. Tarditi (1968) quotes Adesp. 1325 (III p. 629 Kock) that is not a polyptoton, but only anaphoric: Μητιοχος μὲν γὰρ στρατηγεῖ, Μητιοχος δὲ τὰς ὁδοὺς, | Μητιοχος δ' ἄρτους ἐπωπιᾷ, Μητιοχος δὲ τάλφια, | Μητιοχος δὲ πάντα ποιεῖ, Μητιοχος δ' οἰμώζεται.

⁵¹ McGlew (1993: 2).

Other characters with significant names are Cerycides (*kēryks* + *ídēs*) a “Herald’s son” to whom the speaker sends a “grieving message stick” (Fr. 185 *IEG*) and perhaps Koiranos (“commander”, “chief” or “lord”?⁵²), that would have been spared of a shipwreck by Poseidon Hippios (Fr. 192 *IEG*).

Besides Glaucus, another character that may have been historical is Pericles, a contemporary of Archilochus⁵³ to whom the well-known elegy (Fr. 13 *IEG*) is addressed and who is criticized for his behavior at symposia, according to Athenaeus (*Deipn.* 1.7f-8b)⁵⁴:

Fr. 124 a-b *IEG* ὅτι περὶ Περικλέους φησὶν Ἀρχίλοχος ὁ Πάριος ποιητὴς ὡς ἀκλήτου ἐπεισπαίοντος εἰς τὰ συμπόσια

(a) Μυκονίων δίκην.

δοκοῦσι δ’ οἱ Μυκόνιοι διὰ τὸ πένεσθαι καὶ λυπρὰν νῆσον οἰκεῖν ἐπὶ γλισχρότητι καὶ πλεονεξία διαβάλλεσθαι . . .

(b) πολλὸν δὲ πίνων καὶ χαλίκρητον μέθυ⁵⁵,
οὔτε τιμον εἰσενείκας⁵⁶ <- υ - x - υ -⁵⁷>
οὐδὲ μὲν ⁵⁸ κληθεῖς < υ -x⁵⁹> ἦλθες οἷα δὴ φίλος,
ἀλλὰ σεο⁶⁰ γαστήρ νόον⁶¹ τε καὶ φρένας παρήγαγεν
5 εἰς ἀναιδείην,

Ἀρχίλοχος φησιν.⁶²

⁵² Corrêa (2010: 224): “According to Frisk (1960-1972), the term means “commander of troops”, associated with *herjann* (surname of Odin), and Chantraine (1999, s.v. κοῖρανος) derives it from **koryo*, that is a “group of warriors”. Therefore, “lord Poseidon” saves another lord, the “Koiranos”, by means of a dolphin that in Oppian (*Hal.* 2.533) is himself a “great lord of the maritime troops”.

⁵³ See Pericles in Archilochus (Fr. 13.1, 16, 28.4? *IEG*), and also Aristides (*Or.* 46, ii.380.21 Dindorf).

⁵⁴ This is a difficult and corrupt passage, but the occasion of performance might have been the symposium that is the matter of these verses and the very reason why Athenaeus preserved them.

⁵⁵ Casaubon, μεθύων codd.

⁵⁶ εἰσενείκας Kaibel. εἰσενέγκας [οὔτε - ~ -] Hoffmann (1898), Edmonds (1931), εἰσήνεγκας codd., εἰσενεγκών Eust.

⁵⁷ <- ~ Μυκονίων δίκην> Lasserre (1958) follows Snell (*apud* Bossi 1990²: 183).

⁵⁸ Hoffmann (1898). μὴν Edmonds (1931).

⁵⁹ <έσ>ἦλθες Casaubon, Edmonds (1931), Lasserre (1958), ὑφ’ ἡμέων Hiller-Crusius (1897), Hoffmann (1898), ὑφ’ ἡμέων Diehl 1 & 2 (<Περικλείς>?), < Περικλείς > Adrados (1990³), δὴ ἔς <φίλους> φίλος Edmonds (1931), δ’ ἔς <φίλους> φίλος Lasserre (1958).

⁶⁰ σευ codd., σεδ Hoffmann (1898), σ’ (ἦ) Porson, Bergk (1866), Hiller-Crusius (1897), Diehl (1), σ’εϋ] Edmonds (1931), σεῦ Diehl (2), Lasserre (1958), Tarditi (1968), Adrados (1990³).

⁶¹ νών codd., νόον Casaubon

⁶² There are few commentaries on the text of Archilochus Fr. 124^a-b *IEG* that is problematic. Besides those of Medaglia (1982) and Bossi (1990²), there are only lexical

Archilochus, the poet of Paros, speaks of Pericles as bursting into drinking parties uninvited

(a) like the people of Myconos

It seems that the Myconians had a bad name for stinginess and greed because of their poverty and because they lived on a wretched island . . .

(b) Although you consumed a large quantity of unmixed wine, you did not contribute to the cost . . . nor again did you come invited . . . as though a friend, but your belly led astray your mind and wits to shamelessness,

Archilochus says.”

There still are in the fragments of Archilochus an Archeanactides (Fr. 122.10 IEG) and maybe an Arthmiades (Fr. 29.2 IEG?), of which we have no information. In the narratives we hear of a Thracian Oesydras (Fr. 91.7?, 92 IEG), Erxias (Fr. 88, 89.28, 110 IEG?), and a son of Pisistratus (Fr. 93a. 4 IEG).

Therefore, in the 294 fragments of Archilochus, excluding the names of all divine figures and heroes, there is a total of 31 proper names of individuals (in 47 occurrences) that provide the verses with a wealth of characters and types comparable to those found in Old Comedy: slaves, carpenters, prostitutes, herdsmen, soldiers, kings, generals, musicians, and soothsayers, in a spectrum that reaches all, from the lowest to the highest strata of society⁶³.

As for the anonymous citizen and the collectivity, how does Archilochus represent them? In her recent book, Blok (2017) analyses the concept of citizenship in Classical Athens. As in the 2005 article, Blok examines the vocabulary of citizenship in Homer, Hesiod, the *Homeric Hymns*, and then focuses on Solon, Pindar, Simonides and Theognis. Previously, Lévy (1985) and Casevitz (2002), among others, also studied the same terms without, however, undertaking a thorough scrutiny of the archaic melic, iambic and elegiac fragments. Due to the scope of this paper, we shall restrict this survey to the occurrences of *astoi*, *politai* and *dēmos* in Archilochus.

notes in Hauvette (1905), Scherer (1964) and Page (1964), and a brief commentary in Fränkel (1975: 145) who observes that Lasserre (1950: 120-121) considers πατρόθεν πορθηκίδαι (from Hesychius) as part of the poem in which the fable of the mule (Babrius 62 Perry) would have been narrated. Cf. Medaglia (1982: 117), Aristides (*Or.* 46. 11 p. 380 Dindorf).

⁶³ Cf. Pickard-Cambridge (1927), West (1974), Moulton (1981) and Rosen (1988).

Until the second half of the fifth century B.C., *astói* and *polítai* only occur in the plural, and in archaic poetry *astói* is the most frequently employed of the two terms⁶⁴. However, in the Classical period, from Aeschylus onwards *polítai* becomes the most commonly used designation for citizens, being later superseded by the use of the ethnic names (as *Athenaíoi* for Athenian citizens)⁶⁵.

According to Aristophanes of Byzantium (s.v. ἀστός), there was no difference between the use of the terms *astói* and *polítai*. But Blok (2005: 17) noted that a scholium to Hesiod's *Works and Days* (Schol. In Hes. Erg. 225) offers a means of differentiation: "the *astós* is the opposite of the *ksénos*, and the one who is away from his country (*apódēmos*) is the opposite of the one who is in his own country (*éndēmos*)". Thus, although *astós* and *polítēs* were very similar, *astós* was the marked term, used to make a contrast and "where emphasis was intended with a Strong connotation of 'belonging to us'"⁶⁶.

In the remaining fragments of Archilochus there are only two occurrences of *astói*, in Fr. 170 and 133 IEG. Hephaestion (*Ench.* 15. 2) quotes fragment 170 IEG in which "citizens" (*astói*) and "the majority" (*hoi polloi*) are mentioned:

Fr. 170 IEG ἀστών δ' οἱ μὲν κατόπισθεν ἦσαν, οἱ δὲ πολλοὶ

some of the citizens were behind, but the majority . . .

The second occurrence of *astói* is in verses preserved by Stobaeus (4. 58. 4):

Fr. 133 IEG οὔτις αἰδοῖος μετ' ἀστών οὐδὲ περίφημος θανόντων
γίνεται· χάριν δὲ μᾶλλον τοῦ ζοοῦ διώκομεν
<οἱ> ζοοί, κάκιστα δ' αἰεὶ τῷ θανόντι γίνεται.

Once dead no one is held in respect among the citizens even though he be powerful (?). Instead we the living curry the favour of the living and the dead are always the worst off.

Unfortunately we have no more than this that tells us very little about who were these citizens and what they did. There is no evident marked use of *astói* to draw a contrast between those who belong to the city and foreigners in Fr. 170 IEG, no indication of genre, nor of sociopolitical ranking, and in what is left of both poems, *astói* appears to be simply a term that designates the inhabitants of a urban center collectively⁶⁷. In fragment 133 IEG, *astói*

⁶⁴ Blok (2005: 15).

⁶⁵ Blok (2005: 16).

⁶⁶ Blok (2005: 17).

⁶⁷ The term "*ásty* could be used as a synonym for *polis*, but it could also indicate with

may have been used because it was the most common term, because of the alliteration with *aidōios*, or perhaps to mark these dead as “belonging to us”, and therefore deserving our respect, fame and grace (*aidōs*, *phēmē*, *kháris*)⁶⁸.

As *astoi*, *polítai* only occurs in the plural in the Archaic period, with the exception of a proper name in Homer. Likewise, *polítai* in the Archaic texts is a collective term for the inhabitants of the *pólis*, but without the political implications of citizens rights and obligations that the term will acquire later in the fifth, and specially after the fourth century B.C. when *polítēs* (in the singular) becomes the most common way to refer to a free citizen with specific rights and duties⁶⁹.

There is only one occurrence of *polítai* in Archilochus. In Aristophanes (*Peace*, 603-4), Hermes says: “Farmers most wise, take note of my words if you wish to hear how Peace has disappeared.”⁷⁰. A scholium to Aristophanes explains:

Fr. 109 *IEG* Schol. ad loc. (p. 95 Holwerda) πρὸς ταῦτα καὶ Κρατῖνος ἐν Πυτίνῃ πεποιήκεν (fr. 211 K.-A.) “ὧ̃ λυπερνῆτες πολῖται, τὰμὰ δὴ ξυνίετε.” ἔστι δὲ πρὸς τὰ Ἀρχιλόχου·

<ὧ̃> λυπερνῆτες πολῖται, τὰμὰ δὴ συνίετε
ρήματα.

With reference to this Cratinus in Pytine (211 K.-A.) has composed: “Indigent citizens, take note of my words.” And this comes from Archilochus:

Indigent citizens, take note of my words.⁷¹

emphasis the urban center in contrast to the countryside or a smaller town nearby” (Blok, 2005: 17).

⁶⁸ These verses also express Archilochus’ so-called realism, in comparison to Tyrtaeus Fr. 12. 23-34 *IEG*, in which those killed in combat are said to receive *aidōs* and are honored after their death (Cairns, 1993: 167, n. 64). Cf. Archilochus Fr. 134 *IEG*: Schol. Hom. *Od.* 22. 412 “it is not sanctioned by divine law to boast over the dead”) Hence Archilochus says: ‘for it is not good to jeer at the dead’”

⁶⁹ Blok (2005: 12-14).

⁷⁰ vv. 603-4: ὧ̃ σοφώτατοι γεωργοί, τὰμὰ δὴ ξυνίετε | ῥήματ’, εἰ βούλεσθ’ ἀκοῦσαι τήνδ’ ὅπως ἀπόλετο.

⁷¹ For Gerber (1999) σοφώτατοι in Aristophanes (*Pax* 603ss.) “is apparently an error for λυπερνῆτες”.

Gerber (1999) suggests that this fragment 109 *IEG* of Archilochus could have been part of an exhortation to emigrate to Thasos. It could well have been a grave poem, as were many of Archilochus' trochaic tetrameters, and lack of food and resources has been pointed out as one of the causes of the seventh century migrations in Greece.

The term *polítai* in Archilochus 109 *IEG* does not indicate gender, nor social status, and as in most of the early occurrences, it is qualified by an adjective that defines it, since at first it only indicates the inhabitants of the *pólis*⁷². One may note how the beginning of this speech with an interjection, adjective and the vocative *polítai* reproduces the pattern of the political speeches addressed to citizens gathered in assemblies, typical of later oratory.

Another term used by Archilochus for the collectivity is *dēmos*. In the fifth century Athens *dēmos* was usually employed for free citizens of inferior socioeconomic position, and depending on the context, it could be pejorative⁷³. Donlan (1970: 382) in his study on *dēmos* affirms that in Homer⁷⁴, Hesiod and the *Homeric Hymns* the word is not used in a derogatory sense, neither does it have sociopolitical connotations, but that it referred to the community as a whole, excluding its leaders⁷⁵. However, if the leaders were not counted as part of the *dēmos*, the term did involve a political distinction.

The *dēmos* is a district, a physical space, and also the people who inhabit it. In Archaic literature, in Homer, Hesiod and other poets, *dēmos* could designate the people in opposition to the kings (*basileís*) and leaders (*LSJ sv* δῆμος), as the *laós* in the army defines the mass of soldiers in contrast to the commanders and heroes. In Archaic communities, "institutions are informal and dominated by the elite. Yet a closer look reveals that the role of *demos* and assembly is significant" (Raaflaub, 1998: 182), although the kings (*basileís*) were responsible for political decisions, war and the administration of justice. Later, *dēmos* comes to mean "the masses", or the "non-elites" that will dispute the power in the cities with the members of aristocracy, the so-called "noble" (*esthloî*) and "good" (*agathoî*)⁷⁶.

⁷² Blok (2005: 14).

⁷³ Donlan (1970: 382).

⁷⁴ Except in the *Iliad* (2.198-206).

⁷⁵ Donlan (1970: 385) however notes a larger distance and tension between the *dēmos* and its leaders (the kings) in Hesiod's *Works and Days*.

⁷⁶ Hall (2007: 46, 48).

There are three occurrences of *dēmos* in Archilochus' extant fragments (Fr. 14.1, 182.1 e 207 IEG). Hephaestion (*de poem.* 7.2) quotes the following verses:

Fr. 182 IEG Hephaest. *de poem.* 7.2 (p. 71 Consbruch) εἰσι δὲ ἐν τοῖς ποιήμασι καὶ οἱ ἄρρηνικῶς οὕτω καλούμενοι ἐπφοδοί, ὅταν μεγάλῳ στίχῳ περιπτόν τι ἐπιφέρηται, οἷον “πάτερ – φρένας (fr. 172.1-2), καὶ ἔτι

εὔτε⁷⁷ πρὸς ἄθλα⁷⁸ δῆμος ἠθροῖζετο,
ἐν δὲ Βατουσιάδης.

Hephaestion, *On Poems*. And there are also in poetry the so-called epodes (ἐπφοδοί) with masculine termination, whenever some surplus is added to a long line, such as (fr. 172.1-2) and also

when the people gathered for the games, and among them Batousiades

There is no explicit negative connotation of *dēmos* in this brief fragment: it only tells us that among the people gathered for the games there was this Batousiades. However, according to Hesychius (Archilochus Fr. 183 IEG⁷⁹), Batousiades was a seer, son of Selleus, and perhaps the same seer that Aristides says Archilochus slandered:

Aristides (*Or.* 46. ii. 380.21 Dindorf): οὐ τοίνυν οὐδ' Ἀρχίλοχος περὶ τὰς βλασφημίας οὕτω διατρίβων τοὺς ἀρίστους τῶν Ἑλλήνων καὶ τοὺς ἐνδοξοτάτους ἔλεγε κακῶς, ἀλλὰ Λυκάμβην καὶ Χαρίλαον καὶ τὸν δεῖνα τὸν μάντιν, καὶ τὸν Περικλέα τὸν καθ' αὐτόν, οὐ τὸν πάνυ, καὶ τοιοῦτους ἀνθρώπους ἔλεγε κακῶς.

Therefore even Archilochus who was so involved in defamation did not slander the best and most distinguished of the Greeks, but he slandered Lycambes, Charilaus, so-and-so the seer [Fr. 182 IEG?], Pericles—his contemporary, not the famous one—and such men.

If “son of Sellus” (*Sellēideō*) is a “mock patronymic” referring to the Selloi who were prophets of Zeus in Dodona (Gerber, 1999), then the fact that this Batousiades is “among the *dēmos*” might bear a negative connotation to the *dēmos*, since the Selloi are described in the *Iliad* as prophets with unclean feet that sleep on the ground⁸⁰.

In Archilochus Fr. 14 IEG, that many considered as part of the “Elegy to Pericles” (Fr. 13 IEG), Aesimides is adverted:

⁷⁷ εὔ τι vel εὔ τοι codd. corr. Bentley.

⁷⁸ ἄεθλα codd. corr. Fick.

⁷⁹ Archilochus Fr. 183 IEG: Σελληΐδεω. Hesych. Σελληΐδεω· Σελ<λ>έως υἱός, ὁ μάντις, Βατουσιάδης τὸ ὄνομα. (“son of Selleus, the seer named Batousiades”).

⁸⁰ *Il.* 16. 235: ὑποφῆται ἀνυπτόποδες χαμαιεῦναι.

Αισιμίδη, δήμου μὲν ἐπίρρησιν μελεδαίνων
οὐδεις ἄν μάλα πόλλ' ἱμερόεντα πάθοι.

No one, Aesimides, will experience very many delights, if he is concerned about the people's [*dēmos*] censure.

This “censure” of the *dēmos* the speaker advises Aesimides to ignore is *epírrēsis*, a term glossed in ancient lexica by *psógos* and *kakēgoría*⁸¹, that are frequently associated to iambi. Implicit in the advice to ignore the censure of the *dēmos* is its power and the fear it evokes.

Who are these two, the speaker and Aesimides? Could they be leaders that distinguish themselves from the others, the speaker considering Aesimides and himself apart from the *dēmos* to which they should not lend their ears? If Aesimides were a man of *dēmos*, the advice given would be simply not to heed the opinion (or censure) of others in general. However, if Aesimides were a companion and a member of the speaker's *hetairia*, the excess of pleasure he avoids for fear of the people's scorn might have been not very different from that which Solon later reproaches in the Athenian leaders: (Fr. 4. 7-10 *IEG*):

10 δήμου θ' ἡγεμόνων ἄδικος νόος, οἷσιν ἐτοῖμον
 ὕβριος ἐκ μεγάλης ἄλγεα πολλὰ παθεῖν·
 οὐ γὰρ ἐπίστανται κατέχειν κόρον οὐδὲ παρούσας
 εὐφροσύνας κοσμεῖν δαιτὸς ἐν ἡσυχίῃ.

and the mind of the people's [*dēmos*] leaders is unjust; they are certain to suffer much pain as a result of their great arrogance. For they do not know how to restrain excess or to conduct in an orderly and peaceful manner the festivities of the banquet that are at hand . . .⁸²

The third occurrence of *dēmos* in Archilochus was registered by Eusthatius in his commentary on the *Iliad* (23. 775 (iv.836. 1 V.d.Valk)). Eusthatius does not quote verses, but just says Archilochus called a woman (Neobula?) “a revolting woman, fat about the ankles”⁸³ and “a public woman” (Fr. 207 *IEG dēmos*), “i.e., common property of the *dēmos*” (*koinēn tōi dēmōi*), “a worker for hire”, and “froth of defilement”, “on the analogy of froth of the sea, and such like” (Fr. 206-209 *IEG*).

According to Donlan (1970: 386 n.16), *dēmos* occurs in Archilochus in the sense of the non-differentiated population, unlike its meaning in Tyrtaeus Fr. 4.5 *IEG* where the “men of the *dēmos*” would include all free citizens except the leaders (as in Homer), but these would already represent a

⁸¹ *Orion* 55.22 Sturtz, *Et. Gen., Et. Mag.* s.v.

⁸² Translated by Gerber (1999b).

⁸³ Fr. 206 *IEG*: περὶ σφυρὸν παχεῖα, μισητὴ γυνή.

constitutional entity with defined functions, rights and responsibilities⁸⁴. However, in another poem of Tyrtaeus, in fragment 12.15 *IEG* *dēmos* is used in the broader sense and without the distinction of leaders, as in Callinus Fr. 1 *IEG*, *dēmos* refers to the city or its population as a whole.

Therefore, in spite of the meager evidence, it is possible that *dēmos* in Archilochus distinguished the people from the leaders, with a social connotation. In Alcman (Fr. 17. 4-8 *PMG*), however, the social differentiation is clear. According to Athenaeus (*Deipn.* 10. 416cd (ii 405s. Kaibel)), Alcman declares his gluttony in these verses: a great caldron will soon be full of pea soup

5 οἷον ὁ παμφάγος Ἀλκμᾶν
ἠράσθη λιαρὸν πεδὰ τὰς τροπᾶς·
οὔτι γὰρ ἀδὺ τετυγμένον ἔσθαι,
ἀλλὰ τὰ κοινὰ γάρ, ὥπερ ὁ δᾶμος,
ζατεύει.

the kind that Alcman, who eats everything, loves hot after the solstice: he eats no (sweet confections?) but looks for common fare like the people [*dāmos*].⁸⁵

The characterization of the speaker in Alcman as a *pamphágos* who eats all, and that prefers pea soup, one of the most popular dishes and that is here qualified as something “common” that the *dāmos* (= *dēmos*) appreciates, marks and opposes the *dēmos* (“people”) to those who like “sweet confections”.

In sum, *dēmos* in the sense of the inhabitants, and not the inhabited space, may be employed since Homer both in a more general and undifferentiated manner, and with social and/or political connotation⁸⁶. The term could be pejorative or not, depending on the literary genre, the context, the occasion of performance and the poet’s ideology.

The occurrences of *dēmos* in Archilochus are relatively rare when compared to the number of individual characters that are named (whether the names denote real people, are significant codenames, or simply name fictitious characters). Archilochus refers to a collectivity most commonly by the ethnic that makes no sociopolitical distinctions and is more concrete. There are references in the poems to Thasians (Fr. 20, 91.44?, 92 *IEG*), Naxians (Fr. 89.6 *IEG*), Thracians (Fr. 42.1, 93.6 *IEG*), from Torone? (Fr. 89.20 *IEG*), Magnesian (Fr. 20 *IEG*), Maronites (Fr. 291

⁸⁴ Donlan (1970: 385-6).

⁸⁵ Translated by Campbell (1988).

⁸⁶ *Contra* Donlan (1970: 387).

IEG), Panhellenics (Fr. 102 IEG) and Bisaltae (Fr. 92 IEG?)⁸⁷. Ethnics are used in Archilochus to designate groups, but also individuals, such as Saian (Fr. 5.1 IEG), a Phrygian (Fr. 42.2 IEG) a Carian (Fr. 216 IEG) and a Karpathian (Fr. 248 IEG). The presence and frequency of proper names, in comparison to terms that refer to the citizen and/or the collectivity depend largely on the genre of the discourse and the occasion of performance.

Although Archilochus mentions the island of Paros⁸⁸, not a single allusion or address to his fellow Parians is left in the remaining fragments. One must not rely on arguments *ex silentio*, but one plausible reason for this is perhaps because the poet addressed the parians directly, and therefore when he did not cite proper names, he used pronouns or *astoi* (and less frequently *polítai*) for the group, resorting to ethnics to mark those who do not “belong to us”: the others, the foreigners.

References

Editions of Archilochus

ADRADOS, F. R. *Líricos Griegos I: Elegiacos y Yambógrafos Arcaicos*. Barcelona: Ediciones Alma Mater, 1956-1976 (1st ed.); Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1990 (3rd ed.).

BERGK, Th. *Poetae Lyrici Graeci*. vol II. Leipzig: B. G. Teubneri, 1882⁴, 1915.

BRUNCK, R. F. P. *Analecta Veterum Poetarum Graecorum*. Strassburg: 1785.

BUCHHOLTZ, E. *Anthologie aus den Lyrikern der Griechen*. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1886.

CRÖNERT, G. *Archilochi Elegiae*. (Auszug aus d. Habilitationsschrift), Göttingen, 1911.

DEGANI, E. *Poeti greci giambici ed elegiaci*. Milan: Mursia, 1977.

DIEHL, E. *Anthologia Lyrica Graeca*. Leipzig, B. G. Teubner, 1925 (1st ed.), 1936 (2nd ed.), 1952 (3rd ed.).

⁸⁷ There are also in Archilochus references to an Ismaric wine (Fr. 2.2 IEG), a Cretan law (or musical *nómos*? Fr. 232 IEG), and a Prienian ass (Fr. 43.2 IEG)

⁸⁸ Thasos is the most frequently mentioned city (Fr. 21.22, 89.19, 93.6, 96.97, 102, 103.2, 104.2, 228, 291, 295b IEG).

- EDMONDS, J. M. *Greek Elegy and Iambus*. London, Heinemann, 1931.
- De FALCO, V. and A. de FARIA COIMBRA. *Os Elegíacos Gregos de Calino a Crates*. São Paulo: Brusco, 1941.
- FARNELL, G. S. *Greek Lyric Poetry: a complete collection of the surviving passages from the Greek songwriters*. London: Longmans Green & Co., 1891.
- GAISFORD, T. *Poetae Minores Graeci*. Vol I. Leipzig: Kuhn, 1823.
- GERBER, D. E. *Greek Iambic Poetry from the seventh to the fifth centuries B. C.* Cambridge, Mass., London: Harvard University Press, 1999.
- HILLER, E. *Anthologia Lyrica Graeca sive Lyricorum Graecorum Veterum praeter Pindarum*. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1890.
- HILLER, E. and O. CRUSIUS. *Anthologia Lyrica Graeca sive Lyricorum Graecorum Veterum praeter Pindarum*. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1897 (4th ed.).
- HUDSON-WILLIAMS, T. *Early Greek Elegy*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press Board & Humphrey Milford, 1926.
- LASSERRE, F. and A. BONNARD. *Archiloque: Fragments*. Paris: Belles Lettres, 1958.
- LIEBEL, I. *Archilochi Reliquiae*. Leipzig: Sommer, 1812 (1st ed.); Vienna: Johann Bartholomäus Zweck, 1818 (2nd ed.).
- MARZULLO, B. *Frammenti della lirica greca*. Florença: Sansoni, 1965-1967 (2nd ed.).
- SCHNEIDEWIN, F. G. *Delectus Poesis Graecorum Elegiacae, Iambicae, Melicae*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck et Ruprecht, 1838.
- SNELL, B. and S. FRANYÓ. *Fruhgriechische Lyriker, II. Die Jambographen*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1972.
- TARDITI, G. *Archiloco*. Roma: dell' Ateneo, 1968.
- TREU, M. *Archilochos*. Munique: Ernst Heimeran, 1959
- WEST, M. L., *Iambi et Elegi Graeci ante Alexandrum cantati*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971 (1st ed.), 1998 (2nd ed.).

ANDREWES, A. *The Greek Tyrants*. London: Hutchinson's University Library; New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1956.

BARRON, J. P. e EASTERLING, P. E. Archilochus. In EASTERLING, P. e B. M. W. KNOX (edd.), *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature I. Greek Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.

BATTEZZATO, L. Meter and Music. In BUDELMANN, F. (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Lyric*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009, pp.130-146.

BLOK, J. Becoming Citizens. Some Notes on the Semantics of "Citizen" in Archaic Greece and Classical Athens. *Klio*, vol. 87, 2005, pp. 5-40.

BLOK, J. *Citizenship in Classical Athens*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017.

BOSSI, F. *Studi su Archiloco*. 2a ed. Bari: Adriatica, 1990.

BOWIE, E. Early Greek Iambic Poetry: The Importance of Narrative, In CAVARZERE, A., ALONI, A. & A. BARCHIESI (edd.) *Iambic Ideas; Essays on a Poetic Genre from Archaic Greece to the Late Roman Empire*. Lanham, Boulder, New York, Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield, 2001, pp. 1-27.

CAMPBELL, D. A. *Greek Lyric Poetry: A Selection of Early Greek Lyric, Elegiac and Iambic Poetry*. (2a ed.) Bristol, Bristol Classical Press, 1967-1982.

CAMPBELL, D. A. *Greek Lyric, Volume II: Anacreon, Anacreontea, Choral Lyric from Olympus to Alcman Anacreon*. Edited and translated. Cambridge, Mass.; London: 1988.

CASEVITZ, M. L'évolution de la citoyenneté en Grèce d'après le vocabulaire. In: RATTI, S. (ed.) *Antiquité et citoyenneté. Actes du colloque international de Besançon (3-5 novembre 1999)* Besançon: Institut des Sciences et Techniques de l'Antiquité (Collection « ISTA », 850), 2002, pp. 93-104.

CHANTRAINE, P. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*. Paris: Klincksieck, 1999 (2^a ed.).

CORRÊA, P. Da Cunha. *Armas e varões; A guerra na lírica de Arquíloco*. 2a ed. rev. e aument. São Paulo: Edunesp, 2009.

CORRÊA, P. Da Cunha. *Um Bestiário Arcaico. Fábulas e imagens de animais na poesia de Arquíloco*. Campinas: Editora Unicamp, 2010.

DEGANI, E. and G. BURZACCHINI. *Lirici Greci*. Florença, La Nuova Italia, 1977.

DONLAN, W. Changes and Shifts in the Meaning of *Demos*. *La Parola del passato. Rivista di studi antichi*, vol. 25, 1970, pp. 381-95.

FICK, A. F. "Die Sprachform der altionischen und altattischen Lyrik", *Beiträge zur Kunde der Indogermanischen Sprachen*, vol. 11, 1886, pp. 242-72; vol. 13, 1888, pp. 173-221.

FISHER, N. and H. van WEES (edd.) *Archaic Greece: New Approaches and New Evidence*. London: Duckworth, 1998.

FOWLER, R. L. *The Nature of Greek Lyric. Three Preliminary Studies*. Toronto, Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 1987.

FRÄNKEL, H. *Wege und Formen frühgriechischen Denkens*. München: Beck, 1955.

FRÄNKEL, H. *Early Greek Poetry and Philosophy: a history of Greek epic, lyric, and prose to the middle of the fifth century*. Trad. M. Hadas e J. Willis. Oxford: Basil and Blackwell, 1975.

GALLAVOTTI, C. Il Tirrano di Archiloco. *La Parola del passato. Rivista di studi antichi*, vol. 4, 1949, pp. 69-71.

GENTILI, B. *Poetry and its Public in Ancient Greece from Homer to the Fifth Century*. Trad. T. Cole. Baltimore, London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1988.

GENTILI, B. and C. CATENACCI. *Polinnia; Poesia Greca Arcaica*. Messina-Firenze: Casa Editrice G. D'Anna, 2007 (3ª ed.).

GERBER, D. E. *Euterpe: An Anthology of Early Greek Lyric, Elegiac and Iambic Poetry*. Amsterdã: Adolf M. Hakkert, 1970.

GERBER, D. E. *Greek Elegiac Poetry From the Seventh to the Fifth Centuries BC*. Edited and translated. Cambridge, Mass., London: Harvard University Press, 1999b.

HALL, J. M. Polis, Community, and Ethnic Identity, In SHAPIRO, H. A. (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Archaic Greece*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007, pp. 40-60.

HAUVETTE, A. *Archiloque, sa vie et ses poésies*. Paris: Fontemoing, 1905.

HEMBOLD, W. C. *Plutarch, Moralia, Vol. VI; Can Virtue Be Taught? On Moral Virtue. On the Control of Anger. On Tranquility of Mind. On Brotherly Love. On Affection for Offspring. Whether Vice Be Sufficient to Cause Unhappiness. Whether the Affections of the Soul are Worse Than Those of the Body.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1939.

HENDERSON, J. *Aristophanes, vol. II: Clouds. Wasps. Peace.* Edited and Translated. Cambridge, Mass.; London: Harvard University Press, 1998.

HENDERSON, J. *Aristophanes, vol. III: Birds. Lysistrata. Women at the Thesmophoria.* Edited and Translated. Cambridge, Mass.; London: Harvard University Press, 2000.

HOFFMANN, O. *Die griechischen Dialekte in ihrem historischen Zusammenhange (III): Der Ionische Dialekt.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1898.

HUMMEL, P. Les composés en lip(o)- dans la poésie lyrique grecque: étude d'un micro-système lexical. *Philologus*, vol. 141, 1997, pp. 145-148.

ITSUMI, I. What's in a line? Papyrus Formats and Hephaestionic Formulae. In FINGLASS, P. J., COLLARD, C. e RICHARDSON, N. J. (edd.) *Hesperos. Studies in Ancient Greek Poetry presented to M. L. West on his Seventieth Birthday.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007, pp. 306-325.

KANTZIOS, I. *The Trajectory of Archaic Greek Trimeters.* Lieden, Boston: Brill, 2005.

LASSERRE, F. *Les Épodes d' Archiloque.* Paris: Belles Lettres, 1950.

LÉVY, E. Astos et polites d' Homère à Hérodote. *Ktéma*, vol. 10, [1985] 1988, pp. 53-66.

MARTINO, F. de e VOX, O. *Lirica Greca. Vol. I: Prontuari e lirica dorica; Vol. II: Lirica ionica; Vol. III: Lirica eolica.* Bari: Levante, 1996.

McGLEW, J. *Tyranny and Political Culture in Ancient Greece.* Ithaca e London: Cornell University Press, 1993.

MEDAGLIA, S. M. *Note di esegesi archilochea.* Roma: Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, 1982.

MIRALLES, C. e J. PÒRTULAS. *Archilochus and the Iambic Poetry.* Roma: Dell' Ateneo, 1983.

MOULTON, C. *Aristophanic Poetry.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht,

1981.

MURRU, F. Le polúptoton de Léophile. *Eos*, vol. 67, 1979, pp. 183-9.

NAGY, G. *The Best of the Achaeans: Concepts of the Hero in Archaic Greek Poetry*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1979.

OSBORNE, R. Early Greek Colonization? The nature of Greek Settlement in the West. In FISHER, N. e H. van WEES (edd.) *Archaic Greece: New Approaches and New Evidence*. London: Duckworth, 1998, pp. 251-69.

PAGE, D. L. Archilochus and the Oral Tradition. In POUILLOUX, J. et al. (Org.) *Archiloque: Sept exposés et discussions. Entretiens sur l'Antiquité Classique X* (Vandoevres, Genebra, 26/8-3/9/1963). Genebra: Fondation Hardt, 1964, pp. 118-79.

PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE, A. *Dithyramb, Tragedy and Comedy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1927.

PIPPIN-BURNETT, A. *Three Archaic Poets: Archilochus, Alcaeus, Sappho*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1983.

RAAFLAUB, K. A. A historian's headache; How to read 'Homeric society'?, In FISHER, N. and H. van WEES (edd.) *Archaic Greece: New Approaches and New Evidence*. London: Duckworth, 1998, pp. 169-193.

RACKHAM, H. *Aristotle, Politics, Vol. 21*. Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press; London, William Heinemann Ltd., 1944.

RANKIN, H. D. Aristotle on Archilochus. *L'Antiquité classique*, vol. 46, 1961, pp. 165-8.

RANKIN, H. D. *Archilochus of Paros*. Park Ridge, N.J.: Noyes Press, 1977.

ROSEN, R. M. *Old Comedy and the Iambographic Tradition*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988.

ROSEN, R. M. *Making Mockery; The Poetics of Ancient Satire*. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.

SCHERER, A. Die Sprache des Archilochos, In POUILLOUX, J. et al. (Org.) *Archiloque: Sept exposés et discussions. Entretiens sur l'Antiquité Classique X* (Vandoevres, Genebra, 26/8-3/9/1963). Genebra: Fondation Hardt, 1964, pp. 89-107.

SHAPIRO, H. A. (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Archaic Greece*. New

York: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

STOREY, I. C. *Fragments of Old Comedy*. Cambridge, Mass; London: Harvard University Press, 2011.

WEST, M. L. *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus*. Berlin, New York: de Gruyter, 1974.

WEST, M. L. *Greek Lyric Poetry*. Trad. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.

ZANETTO, G. Iambic Patterns in Aristophanic Comedy. In CAVARZERE, A., ALONI, A. e BARCHIESI, A. (edd.) *Iambic Ideas; Essays on a Poetic Genre from Archaic Greece to the Late Roman Empire*. Lanham, Boulder, New York, Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield, 2001, pp. 65-76.

Abbreviated names follow LSJ.

FGrH JACOBY, F. (ed.) *Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*. Berlin, Leiden: Brill, 1923-1958.

FHG MÜLLER, C. (ed.) *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*. Paris: Didot, 1841-1870.

IEG WEST, M. L. (ed.) *Iambi et Elegi Graeci ante Alexandrum cantati*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971 (1^a ed.), 1998 (2^a ed.).

K.-A. KASSEL, R. e AUSTIN, C. (ed.) *Poetae Comici Graeci*. Berlin, New York: de Gruyter, 1989.

PMG PAGE, D. L. (ed.) *Poetae Melici Graeci. Alcmanis, Stesichori, Ibyci, Anacreontis, Simonidis, Corinnae, poetarum minorum reliquias, carmina popularia et convivialia quaque adespota feruntur*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962.

V. VOIGT, E.-M. *Sappho et Alcaeus: fragmenta*. Amsterdã: Athenaeum, Polak & Van Gennep, 1971.